SCOTTISH JOURNAL
of
THEOLOGY

Vol. 11, *No.* 2 *June* 1958

EDITORS:
REV. PROFESSOR T. F. TORRANCE
REV. PROFESSOR J. K. S. REID

OLIVER & BOYD LTD.
EDINBURGH: TWEEDDALE COURT
LONDON: 39A WELBECK STREET, W.1.

SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Published Quarterly

Editors:

Rev. Prof. T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.D., D.Theol.,
21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh, 9 (Telephone 46114)
Rev. Prof. J. K. S. Reid, D.D.,
44 Headingley Mount, Leeds, 6 (Telephone 56853)

Consulting Editors:

Rev. Principal J. H. S. Burleigh, D.D., B.Litt.
Chairman of Directors
Rev. Prof. David Cairns, D.D.
Rev. Prof. N. W. Porteous, D.D.
Rev. Prof. A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D.

Directors:

The above-named together with
Rev. Prof. E. P. Dickie, M.C., D.D.
Rev. J. B. Torrance, B.D.
Rev. J. Heron, B.D., S.T.M.
Rev. A. McCosh, M.A., S.T.M.
Rev. J. A. McFadden, B.D.
Rev. J. W. Stevenson, M.A.
Rev. R. S. Wallace, M.A., B.Sc.
Rev. T. M. Murchison, M.A., *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTIONS are invited from members of all branches of the Christian Church.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE—MSS and Books for review should be sent to one of the Editors.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to the Registered Office.

PRICE: Six Shillings and Sixpence per copy, post free.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: Twenty-four Shillings, post free.

PUBLISHED BY OLIVER AND BOYD FOR SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY LTD.

Registered Office : TWEEDDALE COURT, EDINBURGH, 1

CONTENTS

PAGE

Apostolic Succession, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Noel Hall, Canterbury 113

'Episcopate' and 'Presbyterate' in the Anglican 'Ordinal', by the Rev. Professor John M. Barkley, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., Belfast 134

'Time' as a New Apologetic, by the Rev. John Mole, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Leeds 150

The Origins of Baptism, by the Rev. Professor Thomas F. Torrance, D.D., D.Theol., Edinburgh 158

Pastoral Counselling and Traditional Theology, by the Rev. Donald D. Evans, B.A., B.Phil., Grand Forks, Canada 172

'He Was Seen of Cephas', a suggestion about the first resurrection appearance to Peter, by the late Rupert Annand 180

Book Reviews:

James Brown: *Subject and Object in Modern Theology*; Ian T. Ramsey: *Religious Language*, by the Rev. Professor David Cairns, Aberdeen 188

John Hick: *Faith and Knowledge*, by the Rev. Professor John McIntyre, Edinburgh 194

Paul Roubiczek: *Thinking Towards Religion*, by the Rev. T. H. L. Parker, Grantham 197

O. Cullmann: *The State in the New Testament*, by the Rev. Dr A. J. B. Higgins, Leeds 199

Paul Tillich: *Dynamics of Faith*, by the Rev. Dr R. A. Markus, Liverpool 200

G. B. Caird: *Principalities and Powers: a Study in Pauline Theology*, by the late Rev. Professor William Manson 202

Giovanni Miegge: *Religious Liberty*, by the Rev. Kenneth MacKenzie, Edinburgh 204

Helmer Ringgren: *The Messiah in the Old Testament*, by the Rev. Principal Norman H. Snaith, Leeds 204

J. Jeremias: *Jésus et les païens*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 205

Edward A. Maycock: *A Letter of Wise Counsel: Studies in the First Epistle of Peter*, by the Rev. Kenneth MacKenzie, Edinburgh 206

M. Albertz: *Botschaft des Neuen Testamentes*; *II. Band*: *Die Entfaltung der Botschaft*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 207

PAGE

T. F. Torrance: *When Christ Comes and Comes Again*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 209

Ronald S. Wallace: *Many Things in Parables*, by the late Rev. Professor W. Manson 211

A. Allan McArthur: *The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform*, by the Rev. Canon E. Evans, Hellifield 212

Gordon Rupp: *Six Makers of English Religion*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 215

Olivier Prunet: *La morale chrétienne d'après les écrits johanniques*, by the Rev. Dr R. McL. Wilson, St. Andrews 216

Denis Baly: *The Geography of the Bible*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 217

A. Marcus Ward: *The Outlines of Christian Doctrine* (vols. I and II); Wilfred Scopes: *The Parable of Jesus*; A. P. Carleton: *How Shall I Study the Psalms?*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 219

D. P. Thomson (ed.): *What Christ and The Church Mean to Me*, by the Rev. Dr George S. Gunn, Edinburgh 219

Archdale A. King: *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees* and *Liturgy of the Roman Church*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 220

J. A. Jungmann: *Public Worship* (trans. by Clifford Howell), by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 221

Raymond Abba: *Principles of Christian Worship*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 222

Erik Routley: *The Music of Christian Hymnody*, by the Rev. Dr John A. Lamb, Edinburgh 223

IN THIS ISSUE

Articles on Apostolic Succession
Episcopate and Presbyterate
a Theological Study of Time
Baptism
Pastoralia

The Biblical Study is on I Cor. 15.5

Among the Reviews:

Works on Subject and Object
Religious Language
the N.T. View of the State
Pauline Theology
Christian Worship and Hymnody

and two volumes of Sermons

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

by BISHOP NOEL HALL

THE renewed emphasis on the doctrine of apostolic succession which was the outcome of the Oxford Movement in the Church of England is an example of the power inherent in dogmas to recover their vitality. This is no isolated phenomenon confined exclusively to the dogmas of the Christian faith; in our own times we have witnessed the far-reaching results of the revival of the Marxian dogma of dialectical materialism in the sphere of international politics. That bishops are the successors of the Apostles was a belief held without question by the majority of Anglican Churchmen at the dawn of the nineteenth century, but it cannot be contended that they were fully alive to its implications. The awakening came through the publication of the Tracts for the Times. The challenge was sounded with unambiguous clarity in the very first of them to issue from the press. 'Now then,' wrote John Henry Newman, 'let me come at once to the subject which leads me to address you. Should the Government and the country so far forget their God as to cast off the Church, to deprive it of its temporal honours and substance, on what will you rest the claim of respect and attention which you make upon your flocks? Hitherto you have been upheld by your birth, your education, your wealth, your connexions; should these secular advantages cease, on what must Christ's ministers depend? . . . I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built: our Apostolic Descent. The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them, and these again on others, and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops who have appointed us as their assistants and in some sense representatives.' There was nothing new in the terms used by Newman to formulate the doctrine. They do little more than echo the concise statement found in what for more than a century had been the classical Anglican exposition of the Creed. 'Thus by virtue of an apostolical ordination there is

for ever to be continued a ministerial succession,' so wrote John Pearson, Bishop of Chester, after quoting John 20.21, 22, 1 Timothy 5.22 and Titus 1.5 towards the end of his treatment of the article 'I believe in the Holy Ghost'. The novelty consisted in the central importance which Newman attached to the doctrine in recalling the attention of his readers to it. How profound and pervasive the influence of the renewed interest in the doctrine thereby evoked had been on Anglican thought and life was illustrated when in 1888 the whole Anglican Episcopate assembled at Lambeth outlined an entirely new approach to the problem of reunion with the non-episcopal churches of the British Isles in the famous quadrilateral. The fourth Article of that document was worded as follows: 'The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.' The phrase 'Historic Episcopate', used apparently on this occasion for the first time, was thus explained by one of the bishops responsible for drafting the Lambeth Encyclical of 1888, who was not only an eminent ecclesiastic but a great historian, William Stubbs:

> The Historic Episcopate not merely . . . a method of Church Government, in which sense it could hardly be called historic, but as a distinct, substantive and historic transmission of the commission of the Apostles in and by which our Lord formed his disciples into a distinctly organised body or Church. The Historic Episcopate is of the very essence of the Church of England and could not be suffered to be called in question by any body or individual desirous to be incorporated in our Communion.

Bishop Stubbs' explanation makes it abundantly plain that the point on which the Lambeth fathers of 1888 desired to lay stress in describing the episcopate as 'historic' was its apostolicity rather than the fact that it had existed in the Church for fourteen centuries without a rival.

The Tractarian appeal to the doctrine of apostolic succession was an appeal to that form of the doctrine which had been deduced from the anti-Donatist writings of St. Augustine. Tract 74 consists of a catena of testimonies from the Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exhibiting the characteristic Anglican defence of Episcopacy by tracing its descent from the apostolic age, but the most significant document of the Movement is the six-point programme which

Newman, Keble, Froude and Palmer drew up in August 1833 and which contains the affirmation 'That the participation of the body and blood of Christ is conveyed to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates.' The question with which St. Augustine was concerned was actually broader than the traditional description would, in strictness, suggest, for the controversy with the Donatists involved the whole question of the relation of the ministry and the sacraments to the Church, and St. Augustine was in fact the first Christian theologian to formulate a systematic theory of the conditions indispensable in the ministry for ensuring that members of the Church receive the authentic gifts of grace which Christ bestowed on His Church. The main problem with which he was endeavouring to grapple was the discovery of a rational justification for the policy which, during the course of the fourth century, had been adopted with increasing frequency of recognising the sacraments of those who, either on account of heresy or schism, had separated themselves from the Catholic fellowship. The solution he proposed was the idea that ordination, no less than baptism, conferred on the recipient a consecrating seal or character, and this idea enabled him to concede authentic sacraments to the heretic or schismatic while denying their efficacy so long as he remained outside 'the charity of unity'. The Donatists themselves had clung tenaciously to the practice of re-baptising those who joined their sect, invoking the great name of Cyprian as a warrant for their obstinacy. St. Augustine prepared the way for their reconciliation by denying outright the principle to which they appealed, namely that the unworthiness of the minister destroys the nature of a sacrament. By giving currency to the notion of what later came to be known as an inamissable or indelible character imparted by the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation and orders, he affirmed the opposite principle that neither doctrinal error nor the moral unworthiness of a minister can affect the validity of the sacraments he administers. For the sacraments not only confer grace but place a man in a status which once received cannot be lost and the minister is simply the agent of Christ whose power is behind every act he performs. This principle, in the situation which confronted St. Augustine, was a principle of inclusiveness, since the problem

of Reunion in the Ancient Church differed fundamentally from that which confronts the Church of the twentieth century in this respect that the point at issue was whether recognition could be accorded to non-Catholic sacraments in cases where what was done outside the Church was done by rites exactly parallel to those performed within the Catholic Church. It at once becomes a principle of exclusiveness when the question at issue is whether or not recognition shall be given to the sacraments of Christian bodies which have dispensed with episcopal ordination, since it made the possession of episcopal orders the *sine qua non* of valid sacraments, rooting as it did the immutable validity of a sacrament in the correct performance of the rite.

In the West the Augustinian theory of the apostolic succession completely superseded all others[1] and came to be regarded as the traditional doctrine of the Church. Historical research during the last hundred years or so, both into the origins of the Christian ministry and subsequent developments whether undertaken in a spirit of dispassionate investigation or stimulated, as in our own times, by a sense of the urgency of the reunion of a divided Christendom, has shown the Tractarian appeal to the doctrine to be somewhat more precarious than Newman's confident affirmation of it would suggest in the sense that the burden of demonstration rests rather on those who uphold the doctrine than on those who question it. The Augustinian theory, as seen through Tractarian spectacles, is assailable from four different angles.

(1) The process by which apostolic authority was transmitted to the monepiscopate of the middle of the second century in the crucial period following the death of the last Apostles is hidden from us by lack of evidence. The existence of the Apostles as bearing rule in the Church of Christ is an assured fact attested by abundant proof in the New Testament and every ordination recorded in the NT was performed either by Apostles or apostolic men. It is equally certain that when the curtain of obscurity lifts about A.D. 150 there exists a body of office-bearers in the Church who claim to possess the Apostolic

[1] Pope Innocent I (401-17) seems, however, to have been ignorant of St. Augustine's doctrine when in his letter to Decentius, though conceding the validity of Arian baptism, he denies that neophytes can receive the Holy Spirit thereby, 'since when their leaders departed from the Catholic faith, they lost the perfection of the Spirit which they had received'.

authority in its plenitude and that this claim passed virtually unchallenged until the end of the sixteenth century. But in between there intervenes the so-called tunnel period for which the evidence is both too scanty and too conflicting to afford anything approaching rigorous proof that the episcopal line was actually perpetuated by unbroken transmission from the Apostles. As is well known, two theories as to the origin of the monarchical episcopate were held in antiquity, the one associated with the name of St. Jerome and the other with that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the one favoured by Bishop Lightfoot in his classical dissertation on the Christian ministry and the other defended by Bishop Gore and Professor Cuthbert Turner. According to the former view the 'monarchical episcopate' evolved as it were from below through the emergence of a leading member of a collegiate episcopacy into a position of authority over his colleagues; in other words, the historic episcopate is the direct descendant of the New Testament presbyter-bishops rather than the Apostles. According to the latter, the process was directed from above by the Apostles by the devolution through lieutenants like Timothy and Titus of so much of the Apostolic commission as was transferable to the president of the local presbyteries. Dom Gregory Dix in his essay in Bishop Kirk's *The Apostolic Ministry* endeavoured to supplement the evidence hitherto available, by laying under contribution two sources of information which had not been previously explored, at any rate, fully, the early liturgical evidence contained in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus and the traditions of Judaism. He and some of his collaborators laid great weight on the Jewish term *shaliach* as equivalent to ἀπόστολος and based on this an argument to the effect that Our Lord intended to constitute the Apostles as His plenipotentiaries through whom He Himself was pledged to act and it was this commission which they passed on to others. When every allowance has been made for the influence of the presuppositions which some of his critics brought with them, it cannot be said that this contribution to the discussion remains more than a brilliant piece of speculation, too tenuous to bear the burden that is placed upon it. Moreover, for a considerable time after monarchical episcopacy had become the rule of the Church, there is no certainty that authority was invariably transmitted

by the method which later became universal. No less an authority than Duchesne was prepared to entertain the idea that St. Irenaeus was consecrated by the local presbytery of Lyons and there is the notorious crux of the Church of Alexandria. It is inevitable that such difficulties should at least ripple the complacency of those who uphold the doctrine of apostolic succession as being of the *esse* of the Church, since, however transitory or provisional the situations may have been in which some other method of transmission was adopted, on the indelibilist view to which St. Augustine gave currency a single breach in the actual line of consecration starting from the Apostles destroys the succession. Nevertheless, too much weight should not be given to such sporadic anomalies of the early Church; they are on an entirely different footing from the systematic rejection of the pattern of order associated with the episcopate by certain post-Reformation bodies.

(2) 'Apostolic succession' had had a history of two centuries or more before it was finally formulated in the shape which St. Augustine gave it, and the use made of it by Hegesippus, Irenaeus and Hippolytus is sufficiently equivocal to demand a not inconsiderable degree of ingenuity if it is to be harmonised with the later conceptions. It first emerged into prominence during the crisis caused by the Gnostic peril of the second century and has a clearly marked polemical purpose. It was, in fact, the crowning argument on which the defenders of the faith relied in their endeavour to establish the Church's title to an exclusive possession of the genuine Christian tradition by a threefold appeal to the apostolic Creed, the apostolic Scriptures and the apostolic ministry in response to the challenge of the Gnostic claim to possess a secret tradition deriving from the Apostles. This tradition, the Gnostics asserted, had been handed down by a succession of teachers and their claim was met by emphasising the public tradition of the Church through the succession of its official teachers, the bishops, each of whom had taken over from his own dead predecessor the same cathedra or 'teacher's chair' in a line which could be traced back to the original apostolic founder of the see: the correctness of the teaching given from one such chair being guaranteed by its consent with the teaching given from the teachers' chairs of all other Churches. It is plain that this second-century

doctrine of apostolic succession, which reaches its maturity in the writings of Irenaeus, is concerned primarily with the Bishop's responsibility to act as an authoritative teacher. It is true that in order to be qualified to discharge that responsibility the bishop has not only to be lawfully chosen by the community concerned to occupy the vacant cathedra, but also lawfully invested with the 'charisma' of the episcopate through the ministry of those who already possessed it, but no emphasis is laid on the sacramental succession of the bishop to his consecrators. Two corollaries followed from this: (*a*) anyone, however genuinely he might have been ordained to the office of bishop, if he were not the lawful occupant of any particular cathedra, could not, in the view of Irenaeus, be in any line of Apostolic succession; (*b*) inasmuch as the primary function of the bishop was to bear witness to the Apostolic Tradition, a lapse into heresy or schism could disqualify him from his place in the succession. Irenaeus' words in *Adv. Haer.* iii, 3, and IV 40, 2. imply that a Bishop justly ejected from his cathedra, whether on grounds of faith or morals, ceased to possess any episcopal character so that his ministerial acts from that moment were null and void. Similarly St. Cyprian affirmed that it was the duty of the Christian people who at an election had the power to veto the consecration of an unworthy candidate for the episcopate, to disown the authority of a bishop who departed from apostolic doctrine (Ep. 69, *de Unitate* 10), though actually by St. Cyprian's time the conception of the bishop as the personal embodiment of apostolic authority was beginning to supersede his function as a witness to the apostolic tradition.

It is only just, however, to conclude this brief survey of the doctrine of apostolic succession in the early centuries, with two caveats—(*a*) It should be remembered that though in the writings of St. Irenaeus the whole emphasis lies on the teaching office of the bishop, the first appeal to the argument from Apostolic succession in the epistle of St. Clement was concerned with a question of 'order' rather than of 'faith'. I use the distinction without prejudging its legitimacy. (*b*) Though St. Ignatius makes no reference to apostolic succession and for him the bishop is the representative of Christ rather than the successor of the Apostles, his letters are unimpeachable evidence

that in the first decade of the second century, the possession of the 'apostolic' ministry was, at any rate in Asia Minor, held to be the guarantee of the validity of the Church's sacraments (*ad. Smyrnaeos* VIII, 1). This should not be unduly discounted.

(3) The theologians of the Eastern Orthodox Church repudiate the Augustinian notion of an indelible character as a doctrine unsupported either by scripture or tradition. So far as Confirmation and Ordination are concerned, they regard the idea that the gift once received by these sacraments is irrevocable as a contradiction of the truth that the Church is the covenanted home of the Holy Spirit. Strict logic would require them to regard baptism as equally liable to be forfeited, but the actual practice of the Church has not been altogether consistent. The 95th Canon of the Quini-sext Council (in Trullo) which codified the ecclesiastical law of the Byzantine Church, admits the baptism only of some heretics and schismatics and the baptism and confirmation of others and there is historical evidence that the orders of Nestorians and Monophysites were accepted. Generally speaking, the policy of the Eastern Church in the earlier ages towards the sacraments of separated bodies seems to have been dictated by considerations not of the theological demerits of their teaching, but of the age of the schism. The earlier a sect seceded from the Church the more it had missed of orthodox tradition and therefore the less leniency can be accorded to it. This principle was affirmed in the *de receptione haereticorum* of Timotheus of Constantinople (*circa* 580) who rejects without distinction the baptism of sects like the Montanists and Sabellians who broke away from the Church in the third century.

Nevertheless it is a principle of orthodoxy to which the Easterns adhere tenaciously that there can be no true sacraments at all outside the Church: this principle in theory involves an outright denial of the validity of the sacraments of all heterodox Churches. In practice, however, it is very extensively alleviated by the exercise of what is known as Economy, i.e. the power and authority of the bishop, to act as a prudent steward of the household of God in those matters which neither belong to the realm of dogma nor are governed by ecumenical canons. The (as seems to us) exceedingly elastic

limits within which Economy can be applied are thus set out by Professor Dyovouniotos of Athens, in a treatise on the sacraments quoted by Canon J. A. Douglas in his book *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox*, p. 59: 'The Church as holding stewardship of God's grace has power by Economy to recognise the Priesthood and Sacraments of schismatics and heretics. . . . By a usage which obtains very frequently the Church regards as invalid the Priesthood and Baptism of all those schismatics and heretics among whom the Apostolic succession has failed or has been interrupted or among whom the Faith in general or the canonicity of their rite has been perverted. . . . It must be borne in mind, however, that the Church is able both to recognise the Priesthood and sacraments in general of schismatics and heretics among whom they are not accomplished canonically or the Apostolic succession has been broken and also, for reasons which she herself regards as reasonable and necessary, to reject altogether the Priesthood and the sacraments of schismatics and heretics among whom they are accomplished canonically and the Apostolic succession has not been broken.'

With regard to the lesser Eastern Churches, perhaps, one who has spent many years in India may be permitted to interject the observation that the intractable problem of reconciling the rival adherents of the Patriarch and the Katholikos which has distracted the peace of the ancient Syrian Church of Malankara for many years, would be greatly simplified if they, or at any rate the Jacobite Patriarch, could be induced to assent either to the Augustinian doctrine of an indelible character or to the Greek practice of economy.

(4) Though the Church of England at the time of the Reformation most carefully preserved the episcopal succession and thenceforth has steadfastly and consistently maintained the threefold ministry, there is overwhelming evidence that its representative divines in the Tudor and Stuart periods normally refused to unchurch those of the reformed Churches on the continent which had abandoned episcopacy because regular episcopal ordination was not to be had. It is significant that even so stout an upholder of episcopacy as Hooker connects the need for it with 'regiment' and 'government' and not, as Keble acknowledged in an oft-quoted passage from his

preface to his edition of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, with the validity of the sacraments. Moreover, when after being expelled from the Lady Margaret chair of Divinity at Cambridge, Thomas Cartwright launched his assault on the episcopal system established by the Elizabethan settlement, both Whitgift, the future Primate, and the judicious Master of the Temple refrained from opposing the Puritan claim that the presbyterian type of discipline was a part of the Gospel by claiming a similar prescription for episcopacy: hence the clear distinction which Hooker made between things necessary and things accessory, reckoning polity among the latter. It was part of the logic of such a position that those who adopted it, while affirming the apostolic origin of episcopacy, and even its divine institution, should tolerate its absence in Churches which lacked bishops through no fault of their own: consequently they allowed them to be true parts of the Catholic Church professing apostolic doctrine. Moreover, until 1662, there was no law explicitly forbidding ministers who had not been episcopally ordained to officiate in the Church of England and there are certain cases of ministers ordained on the continent holding benefices in the Church of England, discussed in detail by Professor Norman Sykes and Bishop Hunkin on the one hand and Miss Hamilton-Thompson on the other, with regard to which it cannot be said that unanswerable proof is forthcoming that none of them ever exercised a cure of souls or celebrated the sacraments or that, if they did, they had all been formally authorised to do so.

In the seventeenth century England was no longer in the van of the political struggle between the Protestant powers and the champions of the Roman Church, but there was no abrupt cessation of fraternal relations with the continental Churches. The Caroline divines, with one notable exception, continued to repeat the disclaimer of any desire to censure them for their lack of bishops and one High Churchman, John Cosin, was prepared to justify his custom, not followed by some others, of communicating with the French Reformed Church while an exile during the Commonwealth. Hall, Bramhall and Thorndyke, nevertheless, do use great plainness of speech in uttering their conviction that this lack of bishops was a grave defect in the continental Churches, though this qualification itself needs

to be qualified by the acknowledgment that Laud, Bramhall and the non-juror Leslie, included the Scandinavian Churches in which the succession had been broken among the episcopal Churches and stated that the German Lutheran superintendents were bishops under another name, differing 'more in sound than in sense'. Jeremy Taylor voiced a growing scepticism as to the validity of the plea that the foreign Churches had been compelled by an unavoidable necessity to dispense with episcopal ordination. The Scots, at any rate, rejected episcopacy as deliberately as the separatists in England. Many of the Caroline divines cherished the hope that the continental Churches would follow the lead of the Church of England by adopting episcopacy, and when this expectation faded the cleavage between them became more evident. Henceforth, the English Church stood forth as committed to Episcopacy in a way which parted it from foreign Protestantism no less than domestic Dissent. Nevertheless, it was long before any question was raised with regard to Lutheran orders, witness the readiness of S.P.C.K. throughout the eighteenth century to maintain a devoted band of German and Danish missionaries in South India, none of whom had received Anglican ordination. When in 1813 an Anglican bishop was tardily provided for the Indian dependencies, the Missionary Societies did enjoin that all ordinations should in future be episcopal and some of the Lutheran missionaries received Anglican ordination at their own request. Two of the most eminent who did not were Rhenius and Kohloff: the former eventually severed his connexion with the C.M.S. because he objected to the requirement that his own candidates should be episcopally ordained, but Kohloff continued to minister as an S.P.G. missionary at Tanjore until 1844.

This brief and very inadequate, though I hope objective, marshalling of the evidence compels the acknowledgment that the Tractarian appeal to antiquity betrays a want of historical discrimination: many of St. Augustine's conceptions of the ministry were not shared by the ante-Nicene fathers and have always been repudiated by the Eastern Orthodox. But the most searching question which a review of the evidence raises, is whether it follows from the opinions expressed by Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the precedents which Anglican history affords of ministers who had

not received episcopal ordination being actually authorised to minister to Anglicans that apostolic succession is no part of the doctrinal heritage of the Church of England. Certainly those opinions and precedents do bear witness to the latitude which has generally characterised the Anglican temper and prove beyond controversy that it is not *de fide* for an Anglican to assent to certain corollaries which have been deduced from the doctrine by its more rigorous upholders. It can, perhaps, be reckoned as an irony of history that, whereas in the formative period of Anglicanism it was the most uncompromising opponents of episcopacy who were contending for an essential ministry, now the parts seem to be reversed.

The precedents furnished by the restoration of episcopacy in Scotland in 1610 and 1661, not to mention the supervision by an Anglican board of Lutheran missionaries in South India in the eighteenth century, can be justly pled as acquitting the General Council of the C.I.B.C. of the charge of betraying Anglican principles in accepting a gradual rather than a sudden replacement of a non-episcopal by an episcopal ministry in South India, albeit this has involved the anomaly of the temporary co-existence of two ministries in the United Church. Undoubtedly, when the healing of divisions is at stake the Church has frequently been, and should be, prepared to modify the strict rigour of its rules—the question is, of course, how far ought it to go? It is at least an arguable opinion that the fact that a minister is duly authorised to minister in an episcopally ordered Church, though he has not been episcopally ordained, puts him in an entirely different position from one who ministers without such authorisation.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that the method proposed in the Ceylon Scheme and the North India/Pakistan Plan of providing for the Unification of episcopal and non-episcopal ministries from the inauguration of Union is preferable to the method adopted in South India of providing an interim period, chiefly because it obviates both the obstacles which the necessity of respecting consciences, inseparable from the alternative method, opposes to full communion and fellowship within the United Church and simultaneously the hindrances which that method has created to the establishment of full intercommunion between the C.S.I. and one of the parent Churches. There are

certain variations in detail in the Ceylon and North India proposals, but in principle the method proposed is the same. It presupposes two things, namely, (*a*) that the Uniting Churches mutually acknowledge each other's ministries as ministries of Christ in His Word and Sacraments (and *ex hypothesi* repudiate any intention of giving again what has already been given) and (*b*) that there are differences between the various ministries which need to be transcended. What is proposed is that there shall be an act or rather a series of acts of unification in which bishops of the respective united Churches shall preside, the services being so phrased and constructed as to secure to everyone freedom to think that ministers of Churches other than his own lack something necessary, while the rite itself leaves it to God, who alone knows, to supply whatever may be actually lacking.

Nevertheless, the opinions expressed by the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century divines and the historical precedents which those centuries afford for a policy of relaxation, are neither the only nor the primary data for determining the Anglican doctrine of the ministry. At the Reformation the Church of England did deliberately continue the office and work of a bishop and by appealing to Scripture and antiquity as its warrant in so doing declared its mind as to the nature and meaning of his commission and functions. The positive implications of the appeal cannot justly be interpreted to include less than the recognition of a real correspondence between the office of a bishop and that of an Apostle in virtue of which the episcopate can claim to be the divinely appointed focus of unity and continuity in the visible Church. This was the inference which Hooker drew from it, that is to say, if the bold utterances of the Seventh Book of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, published many years after his death, can be adduced as evidence of his opinions, and for all their unwillingness to unchurch all Churches which had abandoned episcopacy and granted that they hedged the assertion with subtle distinctions, at least a majority of Jacobean and Caroline divines can be quoted in support of the opinion that episcopacy exists by divine right.

There are, at least in theory, great divergences among Anglicans as to the significance of episcopacy, some holding it to be

of the *esse* of the Church, others of its *bene esse* and yet others of its *plene esse*, but to all it would be unthinkable to agree to a scheme of union which did not involve the extension of the Historic Episcopate to the projected united Church, and that not merely because a failure to extend it would end all hope of ultimate union with Churches which constitute the vast majority of those who profess and call themselves Christians throughout the world, but precisely because it would represent a break with the discipline of the Church in the first centuries tantamount to creating a new ministry. In other words, no school of thought in the Anglican Communion is concerned to deny or even under-estimate either the strength or the importance of the argument from Tradition: all are agreed in regarding the episcopal succession as the normal and appointed means by which the continuity of faith, office and authority has been maintained in the Church and at one in the conviction that there is no method, other than episcopal ordination, by which a ministry unquestioned and accepted throughout the whole Church of Christ, can be secured. To take a concrete instance, those Churches of Scandinavia which at the Reformation lost the Apostolic succession, have an impressive ecclesiastical structure and set store by their bishops' tenure of the ancient sees held by their medieval predecessors; but how many Anglicans now would be prepared to say that it was immaterial whether or not the special link with the Apostolic ministry which the Anglican Church has preserved were restored to them? An 'a fortiori' would probably not be out of place, if we then turned our attention to the largest Methodist body in the world which derives its episcopacy from Wesley's consecration of Dr Coke as Superintendent for the Methodist Societies in America. Whatever divergences there may be among Anglicans as to the most satisfactory method of so extending the Historic Episcopate, if the question were asked what thereby they were offering to the non-episcopal Churches, there is surely every reason to believe that the declaration made in *the Report of the Committee on the Unity of the Church*, presented to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 would command a very large measure of assent as providing an accurate answer.

The Historic Episcopate, as we understand it, goes back behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry.

For it is not a mere fact, but an institution fulfilling certain purposes. As an institution it was, and is, characterised by succession in two forms: the succession in office and the succession of consecration. What we uphold is the episcopate, maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration as it has been throughout the history of the Church from the earliest times.

But the question of the necessity of the apostolic succession cannot be determined simply by the appraisal of the historical evidence, as though this were entirely independent of the profound doctrinal issues involved. The Apostolic Tradition is a whole embracing elements of Faith, Order and Sacraments and, though something like the distinction between questions of Faith and questions of Order was avowedly not unknown in early Anglican teaching, to segregate them in separate compartments is apt to confuse the issue. As has been fully recognised at the present stage of the Ecumenical dialogue, the crucial question is the nature of the Church and Christ's relation to it; for what we believe about the Church will ultimately determine our belief about the Ministry.

Perhaps the most arresting way of clarifying the doctrinal issues, though I can do no more than adumbrate them, will be to examine two objections to the rigorist view of episcopacy often voiced by its critics.

(1) It is often urged that those who start from the premise that episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church must inevitably be led to insist, and do in fact insist, on categories which are too unyielding to do justice to the situation as it exists, a consideration reinforced today by the brighter hopes for the reintegration of Christendom which quicken our pulses. The Anglican Church has never claimed to be the whole Church as some other Communions do: some at any rate of its champions have rested its claim to be a true Church on its possession of a particular structure. But something less narrow than the famous Branch theory seems to be required, if the unity which we all acknowledge with Christians of the great non-episcopal communions is to be rightly evaluated. What is needed is that we should revise our doctrine of the Church in such a manner as will justify us in saying that, though they are in schism, the schism in their case, equally with that which divides the episcopal communions is a schism within the Body of Christ and not

from it. As Archbishop William Temple said,[1] 'It makes all the difference in the world in our approach to our Free Church brethren whether we say that the Church order which we recommend—and which many of them are, after all, ready to adopt—is the best for achieving the purpose which the Church has in view and therefore is to be adopted, or that it is the only one which constitutes the Church as a Church at all and, therefore, as long as they do not accept it, they forfeit all right to that name.'

The fundamental principle underlying the view that to preserve an outward unity of order, in unbroken continuity, with its original apostolic constitution, is essential to the Church's very being is the presupposition that the Church and the Ministry are so intimately related as to be wholly interdependent. This was stated with epigrammatic terseness by the late Bishop Kenneth Kirk when he wrote: 'The Catholic Church cannot be found except as gathered round the apostolic ministry: the apostolic ministry cannot exist except in the bosom of the Catholic Church.' But the principle was no less unambiguously affirmed in the rather more eirenically phrased pages of the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922 as follows[2]: 'The Church on the Day of Pentecost is set before us in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles as a body of believers having within it, as its recognised focus of unity and organ of authority, the Apostolate which owed its origin to the action of the Lord Himself. There was not first an Apostolate which gathered a body of believers about itself; nor was there a completely structureless collection of believers which gave authority to the Apostles to speak and act on its behalf. . . . The Ministry does not exist apart from the Body nor the Body apart from the Ministry. But Christ in drawing men to Himself, unites them in a fellowship of which the Apostolate, which He appointed, and the Ministry which is its successor, are the ministerial organs. The commission to exercise Ministry is bestowed through those who already hold it, but it comes from the Risen, Reigning and Present Lord Himself.'

I find it hard to conceive how the admission can be avoided

[1] *Essays in Christian Politics and Citizenship and Kindred Subjects* (1927), p. 203.
[2] *Doctrine in the Church of England*, pp. 114-16.

that the endeavour to discover a doctrine of the Ministry which will not unchurch the non-episcopal Communions logically involves a surrender of this principle. In all such theories Church and Ministry are set over against each other and the Ministry is made dependent on the Church in such a way as to imply that the Apostolic Commission is ultimately vested in the Church. It has often been noticed that the priority thereby given to the Church has a certain affinity with democratic theories of the delegation of authority and conceptions of the Ministry have undoubtedly been put forward in our times which tend to assimilate ministerial authority in the Church to the authority which the responsible officers of a democratic society derive from the popular will. 'The Church comes before the Ministry' wrote Principal Lindsay in 1903, 'and it creates for itself and its own needs its ministering service.' That criticism does not fairly lie against the modification of the doctrine of apostolic succession of which Bishop Headlam and Canon Oliver Quick are the most distinguished exponents. The ministers of the Church are ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God and not the elected delegates of a community possessed of power both to distribute responsibilities to its officers and to withdraw the authority it has conferred. But with Dr Quick the validity of the Church's sacraments does derive from the validating authority of the Church rather than from the due ordination of its ministers within the episcopal succession and Bishop Headlam definitely rejected the doctrine that the episcopal organisation of the Church is of divine ordinance and treated it as a matter of ecclesiastical regulation. In the Reformation epoch some of the Reformed Churches discarded episcopacy deliberately, influenced, partly by the argument that there was no scriptural warrant for it, but also by the conviction that corruption had gone to such lengths among the holders of the episcopal office that it was vain to look to them for reformation: on the theory that as the ministry ultimately depends on the Church the freedom which they claimed in that emergency to supersede the traditional threefold ministry by a 'new model' is vindicated. But this solution of the dilemma does, for those who accept it and yet set store by episcopacy, introduce a further unresolved dilemma. For if it be granted that divine authority is bestowed by an ordina-

tion sincerely performed by a group of Christians acting with the right intentions independently of the succession, on what ground can episcopacy in apostolic succession be commended to the non-episcopal communions save that it is necessary in order to transmit some subsidiary ecclesiastical authority which they lack? If that were all that the episcopate could transmit, its adoption could scarcely afford grounds for a very sanguine hope that it could play any effective part as a God-given instrument for restoring to the Church the unity of which it has in the past been continuously recognised as both the symbol and the security. Moreover, such a separation of divine from ecclesiastical authority is exceedingly artificial and seems to cut at the very heart of the conceptions which underlie our ministry. The authority conferred by his ordination on a priest is not an authority which he exercises partly as a representative of Christ and partly as a representative of the Church; on the contrary all his ministerial work is done in the name of Christ acting in and through His Church. For it is fundamental to the sacramental mystery of the Church that, in all its activities as an agency for extending redemption and renewal to mankind, its authority is intertwined with the authority of its Lord in so close a unity as to make them integral to each other.

This intimate interpenetration of the authority of Christ and the authority of the Church has been elucidated by Archbishop William Temple in memorable words, not altogether easily reconcilable with a previous quotation, words none the less which can never be too often quoted in this context as by the careful balance they display in the use of terms they dispose of a whole crop of fallacious assumptions. 'The Apostles,' he wrote,[1] 'were in no sense ministers of the laity, they were ministers of Christ to the laity and to the world waiting to be won. They took steps for the perpetuation of the Ministry and it has descended to ourselves. So when I consecrate a godly and well-learned man to the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, I do not act as a representative of the Church if by that is meant the whole number of contemporary Christians, but I do act as the ministerial instrument of Christ in His Body, the Church. The authority by which I act is His, transmitted to me through His Apostles and those to whom

[1] *The Church Looks Forward* (1944), p. 24.

they committed it: I hold it neither from the Church nor apart from the Church, but from Christ in the Church.'

(2) Language is often used which suggests that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession necessarily involves a sub-personal conception of the mode of the operation of grace. For instance, the late Bernard Manning used the epithet 'mechanical' to describe the idea of the ministry 'as valid or invalid in itself by virtue of its pedigree, called Apostolic Succession' and coined a phrase which others have quoted to the effect that 'it is not to government by Bishops that Free Churchmen object but to salvation by Bishops', with the implication that no doctrine of episcopacy can possibly be integral to the divine plan of salvation. The allegation cannot ultimately be isolated from the widespread suspicion that the Catholic idea of sacramental grace is tainted throughout by magical or unethical conceptions. It has to be acknowledged that the Catholic conception of the sacramental mediation of the redemption and renewal of human nature does demand a doctrine of ministerial trusteeship congruous with it and it may readily be admitted that some popular presentations of that conception lend colour to the reproach that it substitutes the idea of a vivefying substance for a person in the regenerating action of God. Nevertheless, it has been the constant concern of responsible Catholic teachers, and not least in the period of the Middle Ages, to emphasise the truth that the Church's sacramental ministries of grace involve the interaction of divine and human personality in the highest degree: it has never been taught that the sacraments are efficacious in the recipient *ex opere operato* in the sense that they confer a spiritual gift independently of the state of mind or faith of him who receives them; all that has been taught is that certain prescribed conditions have to be fulfilled for the recipient to be sure that he does receive the authentic gift. It is therefore a quite unwarrantable assumption that when a bishop ordains because he has in virtue of succession authority to ordain, his action necessarily involves a less personal conception of the operation of grace than the action of some non-episcopal congregation of the faithful in setting a man apart as an authorised minister of the Word and Sacraments.

Those who value spiritual immediacy above historic con-

tinuity are well within their rights in doing so, but they go altogether beyond their rights if they insinuate that those who value episcopacy as the bond of unity which links each generation of believers with the generations that are past and with generations to come are influenced by sub-Christian ideas. So far from mechanising the operations of the Holy Spirit, such a conviction stamps the mark of personality on the whole constitution of the Church, which in the divine plan is meant to be one not only in space, but in time, by treating it as a living society, a wonderful and sacred mystery, which touches each one of us with its full force through human hands.

In conclusion, it is perhaps expedient that I should, for the avoidance of all misapprehension, make two rather summary statements, which there is no space to amplify.

(1) In 1923 a Memorandum appeared signed by an impressive body of Anglican theologians which contained the following declaration: 'Such Free Church ministries we find it impossible to regard as invalid, that is null and void, or as effecting none of the purposes for which the Ministry has been divinely ordained: we regard them as being in their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church.' In my opinion, it would greatly conduce both to clarity of thought and charity in discussion, if it could be recognised that a reluctance to subscribe to this somewhat ambiguous declaration in no sense implies a denial of the activity of the Holy Spirit in the non-episcopal Communions. It ought to be remembered that the second World Conference on Faith and Order held at Edinburgh in 1937 (Report, p. 20) deprecated the use of the term 'invalid' in the sense ascribed to it by the declaration as calculated to introduce confusion. The most rigorous champions of Apostolic Succession are as sincere in acknowledging that the non-episcopal ministries have been 'blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace' as those who accept the declaration *ex animo* and are equally alive to the value of the contributions they have to make to a more perfect pattern of Christian Ministry.

(2) In offering the Historic Episcopate as an essential element in a United Church, no Anglican, whatever school of thought he may represent, has any least desire to perpetuate

or transplant along with it the feudal or prelatical accretions which in the course of history have gathered round it and helped to distort the conception of a bishop's office which prevailed in the early centuries. Prelacy is as heartily disliked by Episcopalians in this generation as it is by the spiritual descendants of those who resisted it in an earlier age. The framers of the South India Scheme of Union, while excluding prelacy, were determined that the episcopate in the new Church should have all the legitimate authority which it has anywhere enjoyed in the Church according to the mind of Christ, though they were content to define episcopacy in terms of function rather than dogma. It is indeed one of the most encouraging developments of the venture launched ten years ago that, to quote one of its apologists, Marcus Ward, 'Bishops (in the C.S.I.) are rapidly coming to be thought of as the chief pastors of the flock, fathers-in-God of the whole congregation in the diocese, visible embodiments of an authority derived from something much wider than the local Church and much higher than the diocesan Council which elected them can give.' But, perhaps, it might help to keep things in true perspective to remember that such ideas of a bishop's office would not be regarded as entirely novel in certain happy dioceses of the Anglican dispersion overseas, which have never had any quarrel with the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

'EPISCOPATE' AND 'PRESBYTERATE' IN THE ANGLICAN 'ORDINAL'

by The Rev. Professor JOHN M. BARKLEY

In the belief that the Church of Christ is 'one, holy, catholic, and apostolic', and with the prayer that God may bless the Ecumenical Movement and all who strive for the unity—not uniformity—of the Churches, this examination of the Anglican 'Ordinal', in so far as it throws light upon the relationship of presbyterate and episcopate, is undertaken.

Let me first make it clear that as to 'succession' previous to the Reformation, all—Anglicans, Lutherans, Reformed and Roman—are in the same position. The whole Western Church is at one in this respect. Before discussing the 'Ordinal' in detail, let us first outline the position in Dogmatic statements.

The *communior sententia* of the Schoolmen was that the highest Order of the Christian Ministry is the presbyterate, and that the bishop is only a presbyter, who has been given the episcopal office. This is still the doctrine of the Roman Church (Council of Trent sess.xxiii; Smith edit: *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* ii, pp. 1043-5). Concerning the power of 'presbyters' to ordain, Father J. Bligh, S. J., writes: 'The Decree for the Armenians drawn up by the Council of Florence in 1439 says that a bishop is . . . the "ordinary" minister of Ordination, which would seem to imply that in extraordinary circumstances the minister of (this) sacrament can be a priest. . . . And there exist four Papal Bulls of the fifteenth century which empowered abbots, who were not bishops, but simple priests, to ordain their subjects to sacred orders; two of them explicitly give power to ordain even to the priesthood . . . as this was known and tolerated by bishops and Popes, it is better to admit that a priest can by Papal Indult confer the sacrament of Orders' (*Ordination to the Priesthood*, pp. 8-9).

That the Reformed Church held to the opinion that the 'presbyterate' is the highest Order of the Christian ministry, and that 'presbyters' had the power to ordain because they were apostolic presbyter-bishops scarcely requires stating

(Calvin, *Inst.* IV, iii; *Scot. Journal of Theol.* ix, pp. 150-60). Of course, they rejected the necessity for 'Papal Indult' because they rejected the claims of the Papacy on 'the primacy of the Romish See' (Calvin, *Inst.* IV, vi). In passing, it may be noted that Anglicanism, also, rejected the Papal claims, for the 'Oath of the King's Supremacy' taken by deacons, presbyters, and bishops, opens: 'I from henceforth shall utterly renounce, refuse, relinquish, and forsake the Bishop of Rome, and his authority, power, and jurisdiction' (Brightman, *English Rite*, pp. 948, 980, 1004).

It appears to be true that, at first, in the Church of England also, 'presbyterate' and 'episcopate' were considered to be one 'Order'. Admittedly she continued to have bishops, presbyters, and deacons, but I believe that, at first, she accepted the Western Catholic tradition, and only departed from it later, and so came to regard presbyters and bishops as 'two essentially different Orders'.

In considering this question, we must confine our study to official documents and cut out, so far as possible, all individual authorities, no matter how outstanding. Let us, therefore, limit ourselves to the 'Institution of a Christian Man', the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man', the 'Articles of the Christian Religion', and the 'Ordinals' of 1550, 1552, and 1661.

In the 'Institution of a Christian Man', published in 1536, and recommended and subscribed by the two Archbishops, nineteen Bishops, and the Lower House of Convocation, it is maintained that 'in the New Testament there is no mention of any degree or distinction in orders, but only of Deacons or Ministers, and of Presbyters or Bishops'.

In the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man', approved by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Lower House of Parliament, and published in 1543 by order of the King, it is declared that 'of these two orders only that is to say Priests and Deacons, the Scripture maketh express mention'. Both these documents of the Anglican Reformation maintain the identity of 'presbyter' and 'bishop' in the NT, and are in harmony with the scholastic view that the presbyterate is the highest Order of the Christian Ministry.

When one turns to the 'Thirty-nine Articles', the relevant

article is number xxxvi. In 1553, when it was Article xxxv, it read:

> The Book which of very late time was given to the Church of England by the king's authority, and the Parliament, containing the manner and form of praying, and ministering the Sacraments in the Church of England, likewise also the book of ordering Ministers of the Church, set forth by the foresaid authority, are godly, and in no point repugnant to the wholesome doctrine of the Gospel but agreeable thereunto, furthering and beautifying the same not a little, and therefore of all faithful members of the Church of England, and chiefly of the ministers of the word, they ought to be received, and allowed with all readiness of mind, and thanksgiving, and to be commended to the people of God.

This was replaced, in 1563, by:

> The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it anything that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book since the second year of the aforenamed King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

This contributes little to our subject beyond making it clear that it must be taken in conjunction with the 'Ordinal'. The two are a unity.

When discussing the 1896 Bull, 'Apostolicae Curae', of Leo XIII, Anglicans insist on the quoting of the Preface to the 'Ordinal' when dealing with the question of 'Intention'. I have no wish to enter into the Anglican *v.* Papal controversy, so I content myself by saying that I believe that in this contention Anglican apologists are justified. The words to which they generally refer are, 'It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scripture, and ancient Authors, That from the Apostles' time, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons'. However, one must continue with the next sentence: 'Which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation that etc. . . .' (Brightman, p. 930).

Concerning this, it is sufficient, as a historian, to say that it may be accepted only as meaning that the Church of England maintains the three ancient 'offices' of bishop, presbyter, and deacon, for much depends on how the term 'office' governs

the term 'order'. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that it is not sufficient to quote the Preface; the Rites require study.

Turning to the 'Ordinal' let us, first, examine the lections. For the sake of easy reference I will set out a complete list in canonical order of those in the Anglican 'Ordinals' of 1550, 1552, and 1661, with the epistles given first, with a brief summary of the contents of each. They are:

For Deacons:

Acts 6.2-7. The appointment of the Seven (Medieval theologians regarded this as recording the institution of the diaconate.)

1 Tim. 3.8-16. 'The deacons must be . . .'

For Priests and Bishops:

Acts 20.17-35. In which Paul says to the presbyters of Ephesus 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops'.

Eph. 6.7-13. 'Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ . . . And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; . . .'

1 Tim. 3. 'This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop . . .'

Matt. 9.36-38. In which Jesus speaks of the multitudes as 'sheep having no shepherd', and the harvest being 'plenteous'.

Matt. 28.18-20. The apostolic commission, 'Go ye and teach all nations . . .'

John 10.1-16. The allegory of the Good Shepherd.

John 20.19-23. In which Jesus says 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost . . .' (Medieval exegesis had been wont to treat this passage as describing the Apostles' 'ordination', and many medieval theologians had treated this particular formulary in the rite as the essential 'Form' of the sacrament, an opinion endorsed by the Council of Mainz in 1549.)

John 21.15-17. In which Jesus says to Peter, 'Feed my lambs, Feed my sheep'. (In the medieval period this passage was quoted not only in connexion with the episcopal office but in support of the primacy of the Pope.)

The lections in the three 'Ordinals', 1550, 1552, and 1661, at the Ordering of deacons are Acts 6.2-7, or 1 Tim. 3.8-16, except that in 1661 the verses of the latter are reduced to 8-13 (Brightman, pp. 945-6).

The lections at the ordination of presbyters in the 1550 and 1552 'Ordinals' are (Brightman, p. 968):

Acts 20.17-35, or 1 Tim. 3.

Matt. 28.18-20, or John 10.1-16, or John 20.19-23.

The lections at the ordination of presbyters in the 1661 'Ordinal' are (Brightman, p. 969):

Eph. 4.7-13.
Matt. 9.36-38, or John 10.1-16.

The lections at the consecration of bishops in the 1550 and 1552 'Ordinals' are (Brightman, p. 998):

1 Tim. 3.1-7.
John 21.15-17, or John 10.1-16.

The lections at the 'consecration and ordination' of bishops in the 1661 'Ordinal' are (Brightman, p. 999):

1 Tim. 3.1-7, or Acts 20.17-35.
John 21.15-17, or John 20.19-23, or Matt. 28.18-20.

The full importance of the lections is only grasped when one remembers that they are definitive. In the Ordination of presbyters it, the words in brackets being omitted in 1661, says:

The Bishop . . . shall say unto them (which are appointed to receive the said Office) as hereafter followeth':

'You have heard brethren, as well in your private examination, as in the exhortation, and in the holy lessons taken out of the Gospel, and of the writings of the Apostles, of what dignity, and of how great importance this office is whereunto ye be called' (Brightman, p. 980).

The words 'which was now made to you' were added after 'exhortation' and 'be called' was changed to 'are called' in 1661. The important fact to note, however, is that the lections are definitive of the Office. This means that they must be carefully examined.

Because the lections in the 'Ordinals' of 1550 and 1552 are identical, in what follows I will treat them together under the earlier date. Let us first take the lections at the Ordination of Presbyters and at the Consecration of Bishops in 1550.

Presbyters (1550)	*Bishops* (1550)
Acts 20.17-35	1 Tim. 3.1-7
1 Tim. 3	
Matt. 28.18-20	John 10.1-16
John 10.1-16	John 21.15-17
John 20.19-23	

Here we find one of the Epistles and one of the Gospels the same. The others, also, are of interest when considered in the light of their contents and the exegesis summarised in the complete list set out above, in that Matt. 28 and John 20 were both

held to refer to the apostolic commission, and Acts 20 treats 'presbyters' as 'bishops'.

Now let us take the lections at the Ordination of presbyters in 1550, and examine what happens to them in 1661:

Acts 20 is omitted from the rite for presbyters and placed in that for bishops, where it had not appeared in 1550.

1 Tim. 3 is omitted from the rite for presbyters and retained in that for bishops, where it had also appeared in 1550.

Matt. 28 is omitted from the rite for presbyters and placed in that for bishops, where it had not appeared in 1550.

John 10, which had appeared in the rites for both presbyters and bishops in 1550, is retained in the rite for priests and omitted in that for bishops.

John 20 is omitted from the rite for priests and placed in that for bishops, where it had not appeared in 1550.

Indeed, it is most interesting to set out the lections for presbyters in 1550 and bishops in 1661 in parallel columns:

Presbyters (1550)	*Bishops* (1661)
Acts 20.17-35	Acts 20.17-35
1 Tim. 3	1 Tim. 3.1-7
Matt. 28.18-20	Matt. 28.18-20
John 10.1-16	John 20.19-23
John 20.19-23	John 21.15-17

When one turns from these two rites to consider those for presbyters in 1550, and 1661, a most interesting fact must be noted, namely, that in the latter every reference to 'presbyter' and 'bishop' has been cut out of the lections, and the statement 'you have heard brethren, etc.' is retained. This means that the lections are still held to be definitive.

The reason for the changes in the lections, as with others to which we will refer later, was to exclude the Presbyterians, who maintained that 'presbyter' and 'bishop' were one Order. Consequently Acts 20, Matt. 28, and John 20 were omitted in the case of presbyters, and placed for the first time in the rite for bishops.

In view of this, I think, we may say that the lections point to the conclusion that prior to 1661 Anglicanism retained the Catholic tradition of the West, namely, that the presbyterate is the highest Order, including both presbyters and bishops, but in 1661, she departed from this and has since then treated presbyters and bishops as two 'essentially different Orders'.

In passing, it may be noted that in the Ordering of Deacons, and the Consecration of Bishops, there is no reference to the lections being definitive. However, personally, I should not press this too far, as I believe that the intention of the Anglican reformers was that they should be so regarded.

In connexion with the 'necessity' and 'exposition' of Orders emphasis is sometimes placed on the rubrics in the 'Ordinal', requiring the preaching of a sermon. It, therefore, is instructive to examine the evidence in this regard.

(1) In the 1550 'Ordinal' the rubric at the Making of Deacons states that

> there shall be an exhortation, declaring the duty and office of such as come to be admitted ministers, how necessary such orders are in the Church of Christ, and also, how the people ought to esteem them in their vocation (Brightman, p. 932).

At the Ordering of Priests the rubric reads:

> When the exhortation is ended, then shall be sung for the Introit to the Communion, this Psalm (Brightman, p. 960).

At the Consecration of an archbishop or bishop, there was NO provision for either a sermon or an exhortation.

(2) In the revision of the 'Ordinal' in 1552 no change was made (Brightman, pp. 933, 961).

(3) In the 1661 'Ordinal' the rubric at the Making of Deacons reads:

> There shall be a Sermon or Exhortation, declaring the duty and office of such as come to be admitted Deacons; how necessary that Order is in the Church of Christ; and also how the people ought to esteem them in their office (Brightman, p. 933).

At the Ordering of Priests the rubric is exactly the same as that in the rite for deacons with the word 'Priests' for 'Deacons' (Brightman, p. 959).

At the Consecration of an archbishop or bishop the rubric reads:

> After the Gospel, and the Nicene Creed, and the Sermon, are ended . . . (Brightman, p. 1005).

Thus the sermon at the consecration of a bishop first makes its appearance in the English 'Ordinal' in 1661.

The rubrics *per se* concerning the sermon supply no real evidence concerning our study, except in a negative sort of way. This is evident from the words of Dr Norman Sykes: 'If

emphasis be laid upon the rubric at the Ordering of Deacons and Priests, requiring an exhortation "how necessary such orders are in the Church of Christ", it may be a matter of delicacy to account for the lack of such provision at the consecrating of a bishop, where, even after 1662, the subject of the sermon is not mentioned' (*Old Priest and New Presbyter* p. 12). At the same time, however, it may be noted that, even in the 1661 'Ordinal', 'how necessary that Order is in the Church of Christ' is used only of presbyters and deacons.

Let us now turn to what is generally spoken of as the 'Form' of the rite. In the Ordering of Presbyters in the 1550 'Ordinal' it was:

> Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven: and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained, and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the father, and of the son, and of the holy ghost. Amen (Brightman, p. 994).

In the 1661 'Ordinal' this was changed to:

> Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office, and work of a Priest, in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins etc. . . . Amen (Brightman, p. 995).

In the rite for the Consecration of bishops in 1550 the words are:

> Take the holy ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness (Brightman, p. 1014).

In 1661 these words were changed to:

> Receive the holy Ghost, for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost, Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee, by this imposition of our hands: For God hath not given us the spirit of fear: but of power, and love, and soberness. (Brightman, p. 1015).

An interesting point arises here concerning the relation of the 'Power of the Keys' to ordination and succession. It is significant that this conception is repeated by the Risen Lord (John 20.20*a*-23) after it had been given originally by the historical Jesus to the disciples (Matt. 16.13-20; 18.18). 'Both according to the express declaration (Matt. 18.18), and according to what we can learn from the New Testament about the actual practice of the Apostles, this commission consists in witnessing by

means of the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. No third action has a place beside these two, which are in essence one, the "*ministerium verbi divini*". The saying about the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 16.19) in particular must not be regarded as an extension but as another way of describing this one office and commission of the Church. It is in the reception and in the exercise of this one commission, and not otherwise, that the Church is "*communio sanctorum, congregatio fidelium*" ' (Barth, *Credo*, p. 143). It is significant that the Anglican 'Ordinal' includes this, even after 1661, in the ordination to the presbyterate and not in the consecration to the episcopate.

Two other points arise here: (*a*) the reason for the adoption of the 'Form' in the Ordering of presbyters, and (*b*) the reason for the changes made in 1661.

To deal with the former, first, as stated above medieval exegesis had been wont to treat John 20.19-23 as describing the ordination of the apostles by Jesus, and to regard it as the 'essential' form of the rite. A further determining influence was that this was the only one of all those found in the 'Pontificals' which was to be found in Scripture. The Anglican reformers might well contend, therefore, that a 'Form' used as such (as they supposed) by our Lord Himself was incontrovertibly secure. These were the reasons for its adoption. Writing on the words 'Accipe Spiritum sanctum etc. . . .' in the 'Pontifical', Dom Pierre de Puniet, O.S.B., says: 'This ceremony is a late development; it originated in certain French Churches in the twelfth century, and is one of the things we derive from Durandus of Mende. This is not to deny it its deep significance, for it symbolises the transmission of the power of the keys of which no mention is made in the other formulas. It is indeed a ceremony full of practical teaching, which repeats the words spoken by our Saviour to His Apostles, and thus makes all those present realise the ever present working of Christ in the solemn act which confers the priestly "character" and the powers inherent in Holy Orders' (*The Roman Pontifical*, pp. 262-3).

To turn to the latter, the reason for the change in the 'Form' in 1661 was that a considerable number of Reformed ministers in Presbyterian Orders had obtained benefices in the Church

of England without receiving Episcopal Ordination. These men were now required by the 'Act of Uniformity' to receive episcopal ordination. To this they objected, on the ground that they had already been ordained by other Presbyterian ministers, and that there was no difference between a presbyter and a bishop. In support of this contention, they cited the fact that 'the words of ordination said nothing to him (that is, a man being consecrated bishop) in the old Ordinal (1552) which he had not already as a Priest'. It was to remove this Presbyterian contention that the Lections and 'Forms' were changed in 1661 (Burnet, *Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England*, p. 71; Burnet, *History of the Reformation* ii, p. 144; Prideaux, *Ecclesiastical Tracts*, pp. 15, 36, 69-72; Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, pp. 385-9).

That so great changes in the 'Ordinal' were necessary in 1661 to include in the intention of the Church of England 'the exclusion of Presbyterians' surely shows that, while episcopal ordination was the custom in the Church of England, nevertheless the Presbyterian contention that presbyters and bishops were one Order was well founded. It, also, explains why many Anglican bishops and theologians held that the Churches of the continental reformation had valid orders, and points to the conclusion that the opinion 'that presbyters have no right to ordain' did not spring up in England until many years after the Reformation, although the Church of England, for her part, continued the practice of ordination by bishops. Certain it is, however, that, until 1661, presbyters held livings in England with no ordination except what they received from presbyteries. The 'Act of Uniformity' and the 1661 'Ordinal' completely altered this.

Let us turn now to the 'Presentation' in the different rites. It may be pointed out that each did specify the office to which the candidate was being appointed, whether it was the diaconate, the presbyterate, or episcopate, but the term 'Order' was used only in the case of deacons (Brightman, p. 933) and priests (Brightman, p. 978) up to 1661. It was in 1661 that Bishops were first said to be 'ordained' and 'consecrated' in the title and at the presentation (Brightman, p. 1005).

Another change in the 1661 'Ordinal' in 'The Form of Ordaining or Consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop' was

that at the 'examination' a new question is added for the first time, namely, 'Will you be faithful in ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others?', to which the candidate responds, 'I will so be, by the help of God' (Brightman, p. 1011).

The new title appears to make the episcopate a different 'Order' as distinct from 'Office' to the presbyterate, which was not true in the earlier 'Ordinals'; and the new question appears to limit 'Ordination' to bishops, although no such limitation was expressed prior to this.

In the Litany, the petition, 'That it may please thee, to illuminate all Bishops, Pastors, and Ministers of the Church, etc. . . .', was altered in 1661 to 'all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons' (Brightman, p. 937). Also, the petition, 'That it may please thee to bless these men, and send thy grace upon them, that they may duly execute the office, now to be committed unto them, to the edifying of thy Church, and to thy honour, praise, and glory', was altered in 1661 to, 'That it may please thee to bless these thy servants, now to be admitted to the Order of Deacons (or Priests) and to pour thy grace upon them etc.' (Brightman, pp. 939, 961). These changes also were made because of the Presbyterian contention that 'presbyter' and 'bishop' were one Order.

The only other relevant point appears to be the rubrics dealing with 'the laying on of hands'. For the diaconate the rubric runs, the words in brackets being added in 1661:

> Then the bishop laying his hands severally upon the head of every one of them, (humbly kneeling before him), shall say (Brightman, p. 952).

For the presbyterate in 1550 it was:

> The Bishop with the Priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of everyone that receiveth orders (Brightman, p. 992).

In 1661 the words 'that receiveth orders' were changed to 'that receiveth the Order of Priesthood' (Brightman, p. 993).

For the episcopate the rubric is, the words in brackets being added in 1661:

> Then the Archbishop and Bishops present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected Bishop (kneeling before them upon his knees): the archbishop saying (Brightman, p. 1015).

It is interesting that only in the case of presbyters, in this rubric, is there any reference to 'Orders'.

To conclude this examination of the 'Ordinal', let us return to the Preface. In 1550, it stated:

> It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time, there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christ's church Bishops, Priests, and Deacons which Offices were evermore had, in such reverent estimation, that no man by his own authority, might presume, to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities, as were requisite for the same. And also, by Public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved, and admitted thereunto. And therefore, to the intent these orders should be continued, and reverently used, and esteemed, in this Church of England, it is requisite, that no man (not being at this present, Bishop, Priest nor Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted according to the form hereafter following (Brightman, p. 930).

In 1661, the opening section remains substantially the same, but the second part has been considerably altered. It now reads:

> And therefore to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used, and esteemed in the Church of England; No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination (Brightman, p. 931).

Under the former many, in Presbyterian Orders, were admitted to livings in the Church of England. Here the Preface testifies to a change in that after 1661 'episcopal ordination' is regarded as essential, whereas it was not so regarded formerly, although it was the practice of the Church of England so far as her own procedure was concerned. In other words, the Church of England's own practice did not lead her to deny the 'validity' of the Orders of the Continental Reformed Churches transmitted through 'presbyters'.

While the various rites in the Anglican 'Ordinal' have been analysed in detail, it must be borne in mind that each rite must be considered as a whole, and separate parts of the Service must be placed in their context. Even so, it would appear, from a study of the rites in the Anglican 'Ordinal', that the 1661 'Ordinal' definitely 'swings the Church of England towards an official teaching that there are three Orders', and so away from the Catholic tradition of the West, which is re-

tained in both Romanism and Presbyterianism, namely, that the presbyterate is the highest Order of the Christian ministry.

It has been stated by Bro. G. Every that 'the first Anglican theologian to insist unambiguously on the indispensable necessity of episcopal ordination for a valid ministry' was Bishop Richard Montague (*Scot. Journal of Theol.* ix. p. 180). This was in his *Origines Ecclesiasticae* (ii, pp. 463-4), published, during the reign of Charles I, in the year 1640. The present writer admits that, while he has read much Anglican Reformation theology, he would not claim to be an authority. However, so far as his reading goes, he believes this statement to be correct; and that the fact that insistence upon 'episcopal ordination' as an absolute necessity did not occur until almost a century after the publication of the 1550 'Ordinal' helps to substantiate his opinion. The Preface to the 'Form and Manner of Ordaining Ministers' for Scotland, issued by episcopal authority, in 1620, but lacking confirmation by the temporal power, also, appears to support his view.

Let us now turn to a consideration of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. The 'Directory for the Ordination of Ministers' states:

> If a minister be designated to a congregation, who hath been formerly ordained presbyter according to the form of ordination which hath been in the Church of England, which we hold for substance to be valid, and not to be disclaimed by any who have received it . . . let him be admitted without any new ordination (sec. x).

That this was right and proper no Presbyterian will be disposed to deny today, because the lections in the 'Ordinal' made it quite clear that the presbyter was ordained a 'presbyter-bishop'. However, what is to be said today concerning those ordained in a rite in which every reference to 'presbyter-bishops' has been carefully expunged? While remembering that the Reformed Church has always treated 'presbyter', 'bishop', and 'pastor' (Eph. 4.11) as synonymous terms in the NT, and that the words from John 20.22-23 remain in the 'Form' in the 1661 'Ordinal', one may, nevertheless ask: have we, or have we not, here a new institution? That a new ministry should come into being is in harmony with Rom. 12.4-8, 1 Cor. 12.4-28, Eph. 4.11-16, and Reformed theology: but the question as to whether the Angli-

can 'priest', under the 'Ordinal' of 1661, is a new institution or a NT presbyter does affect the status to be assigned to Anglican 'priests' in ecumenical discussions, especially in schemes for Church Union. A further question may be asked here: are not the scales heavily weighed in favour of a new institution and against a NT presbyter by the Anglican rejection of the 'validity' of Methodist Orders, derived through John Wesley and his friends, who had been ordained 'priests' in accordance with the Anglican 'Ordinal' of 1661? This is virtually a denial of the power to ordain of a 'priest' ordained according to the 1661 'Ordinal'. The conclusion here would appear to be that whereas the changes in the lections in the 1661 Ordinal and Anglican practice point in one direction, leading the Synod of Ulster, in 1808, to receive John Boyle, an Anglican priest, as a 'probationer', because he wasn't a 'bishop', on the other hand, the Preface is capable of interpretation in another.

If our conclusion is correct, from this study of the Anglican 'Ordinal', that while bishop, presbyter, and deacon were retained, nevertheless Anglicanism at first, accepted the *communior sententia* of the Scholastics that the 'presbyterate' is the highest 'Order' of the Christian Ministry, certain points follow so far as ecumenical discussions are concerned.

(1) It should be clearly pointed out that, since 1661 at least, there is a difference between the 'presbyter' in the Reformed Church and the Anglican 'presbyter'. In the latter, the 'priest' is regarded as a delegate of the bishop in that he does not hold the episcopate *in solidum* with the bishop, whereas in the Reformed Church the 'presbyter' is a presbyter-bishop who holds and exercises the episcopate along with his co-presbyters in the presbytery. The definitive Scriptures for the 'presbyter' in the Reformed Church have always been those given for the ordination of priests in the 1550 Anglican 'Ordinal', and for the 'ordering and consecrating' of bishops in the 1661 'Ordinal' (Calvin, *Inst.* IV, iii). Consequently the equating of Reformed 'presbyters' and Anglican 'priests' in Schemes for Church Union should cease.

(2) It must be affirmed that if the presbyterate is the highest 'Order', derived from Christ, through the apostles, their 'Order' includes the power to ordain, even though subsequent action of the Church or Canon Law limited the exercise

of this power to those presbyters who are further consecrated to the 'Office' of bishop. Canon Law cannot denude a Divine Ordinance, and so the Order of the presbyterate includes the power to ordain and is always possessed in virtue of their Order by presbyters through their ordination to do the work of a presbyter. The powers of an Order of Ministry, divinely instituted, are inherent in the Order.

(3) If the presbyterate is the highest 'Order' of the Christian Ministry, this means that, while 'presbyters' normally did not ordain for the sake of orderliness in the Medieval Church, 'presbyters', like Luther, Zwingli, and Knox, etc., had the power to ordain. Consequently 'Orders' through them are valid. On the other hand, if it is maintained that the nature of a Divine Ordinance can be altered by canon, none of the Churches of the Reformation have valid 'Orders', for in medieval canon law the Pope appears as *caput totius ecclesiae*, not only in reference to his jurisdictional authority, but also for ordination authority.

(4) 'The Historic Episcopate' is historic but that does not make it 'essential' to the 'validity' of Orders. At the same time, it must be admitted that for centuries bishops had been 'consecrated' by bishops. This, however, should not blind us to the three facts: (*a*) That while the Church of England preserved the historic episcopate, it was historical events which made this possible. She could quite easily have lost it had Mary Tudor reigned for twenty-five years, or if Cromwell had lived for another decade (Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, pp. 112-14). (*b*) That, for historical reasons, the insistence upon episcopal ordination attained a place in the Anglican 'Ordinal' in 1661, which it had not prior to that date. And (*c*) that, up to Nicaea, bishops were, in some places, consecrated by presbyters (*Journal of Eccl. Hist.* i, pp. 12-28; iii, pp. 1-13; vi, pp. 125-42; Duchesne: *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* i, p. 94), and this did not prevent their episcopal office being recognised in the Church.

From this it would appear that to make the Historic Episcopate an 'effectual sign' of the unity and continuity of the Church, 'creative' of the Church from age to age, and a *conditio sine qua non* for the validity of Orders and of the Sacraments, is to make it usurp the Office of Jesus Christ, the sole King and

Head of the Church, and to give it precedence over the Church which is His Body in a way that is akin to and parallel to the pseudo-claims of the Papacy.

In conclusion, it must be insisted that, if the Churches are to become one in Christ, Schemes for Church Union must not be founded on a basis of expediency, but one of doctrine and principle. This means that the changes made in the Anglican Ordinal of 1661 demand careful study. In this article, I have simply tried to raise some of the questions arising from a historical study of the Anglican 'Ordinal', and would conclude by pointing out that, important as they are, and their importance no one can deny, they must never be allowed to obscure the following NT principles:

(1) That the Ministry of Christ is the 'only essential ministry' in the Church, and all other ministries are derived from and dependent upon Him alone;

(2) That all ministries are functions exercised by the Body of Christ through organs which are organs of the Body;

(3) That bishops, presbyters, deacons, governors, healers, teachers, and all others, minister 'not in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority';

And (4) the unity and continuity of the Church, and of the Ministry within the Church, abides in Christ.

'TIME' AS A NEW APOLOGETIC

by The Rev. JOHN MOLE

While the antithesis between theology and philosophy has never perhaps been as sharply pointed as it is today, in one direction at least it may be considered that research in both disciplines is running along parallel lines. In the study of *time* there is a common ground of interest. This is observable in such essays as *The Fulness of Time*,[1] *In the end God*,[2] *Christus und die Zeit*[3] and in the current interest in eschatology. In philosophy, particularly in twentieth century France from Bergson to Berdyaev, there is a growing 'respect' for time—and an increasing awareness of its *moral* significance. In the belief that this subject affords a common vocabulary we make the following suggestion as a new topic in apologetic conversation. We shall first describe the new conception of time which is emerging, then note its relevance to one aspect of theology, the Fall, and finally suggest the apologetic significance.

In attempting to give an account of the nature of time, the main difficulty in the past has arisen largely from the disparate nature of the phenomena of which time is 'constituted'. The same expression, time, has been used to mean, for example, past-present-future, duration, change; it may refer to our apprehension of these; it may imply their independent reality. We ask such varied questions as, 'Is there a sensation of time?' 'How is time to be distinguished from space?', 'How is time related to eternity?'. At first sight it seems that no one definition could comprehend such variety, and the question, 'What is time?' has received no one satisfactory answer to account for its diversity of manifestation. We suggest, however, that in this very diversity there is the indication of a solution, if we look for an answer in an appropriate terminology. To ask, '*What* is time?' is, in a sense, to beg an answer. Such a question assumes that time is of 'substantival' (or at least 'adjectival') nature and we are led to expect an answer in substantival form. Is it

[1] J. Marsh, London, 1952. [2] J. A. T. Robinson, London, 1950.
[3] O. Cullmann, Zürich, 1948.

not significant that there exists the type of question, 'When?'. May it not be that we should ask '*When* is time?' rather than '*What* is time?'. To treat time as 'substantival' results, at one and the same time, in over-emphasising its independence and under-emphasising its scope. If, on the other hand, we examine the *incidence* of time, as has been done by Bergson, Marcel, Sartre, Berdyaev, we are struck by two facts: first, while time is relative, the variety of its manifestation suggests that it must be relative to nothing less than to *being* itself; second, its relation to being is not neutral but of *moral* significance. Time is not 'substantival' (nor yet 'adjectival' to other 'substantives' such as change or movement or space); it is relative to 'being', in a '*modal*' sense. *As* there is being, so there is time as *mode* of being. The moral significance arises from the fact that time, thus understood, expresses the tension between eternity as the mode of being of Divine Being and temporality as the mode of being of created, fallen being. The focus of the problem is the *present*, which is, from one point of view, the sanction of validity and yet, from another, the symbol of impermanence. It is from an examination of the equivocal nature of the term, present, that an apologetic conversation may begin. The term, present, has a double meaning: first, it may be understood as a 'point of time', necessitated by past sequence and limited by future consequence, and as such it is notoriously elusive; but second, and here we feel is one of the main contributions made by Marcel, Laberthonnière (and even Sartre in a negative sense), it is a locus of choice—the opportunity of *being present* to the other. We may refuse this opportunity of 'presenting' ourselves, preferring, as Marcel would say, to possess. In that case our 'present' becomes a kind of *absence*, a rejection of being—as when the 'pour-soi' of Sartre rejects the 'en-soi' of contingent being and seeks refuge in a 'future' which sets off the whole past-present-future course of our temporality. There is a fundamental choice in the heart of being: either to be present to the other—this is the sense of the process of Creation; or to possess the other—this is the sense of the Fall. Eternity is the mode of being of the former, of God, who continually wills 'the other' into being. The mode of the latter is best described as that of temporality, or past-present-future. It arises from a will which rejects the opportunity of present self-giving and wills instead

to possess, saying: I *will* have. This will for self, as a kind of ontological treachery, by 'emptying' the present results in the establishment of 'future' as a substitute for eternity. The sequence is: (*a*) I *will* (have), resulting in (*b*) I shall (be), leaving behind, as a 'waste product' (*c*) I was. In this sense, past-present-future should be expressed: absent-future-past. This must be understood in a collective as well as an individual aspect. Interacting through the whole structure of being is this willed temporality. From the curse of this temporality we are redeemed by the gift of God in the presence of His Son. The 'time' of salvation is always 'in' the present because salvation is, in all reverence, a *present*. As we realise and accept this presence we enter a new mode of being. The futurism of temporality ceases to be our curse, for we are set free from serving 'the morrow' and empowered to serve 'the neighbour'. The future into which we are still 'carried forward', through the solidarity of the flesh, has no longer the meaning of absence and wilfulness. It means now that God in His forbearance offers the opportunity of redeeming the time.

Such a conception of time has a contribution to make to the doctrine of the Fall. The 'date' of the Fall, which has hithero always been the central problem, now becomes more of a solution than a problem. Discussion of Gen. 3 usually begins with a definition of myth. Thus J. A. T. Robinson suggests that Gen. 3 expresses, by its myth, *universality* rather than originality. While we accept this view, we feel that it 'sidesteps' the problem of *date*, to some extent. The view of time which we have been describing would give a more 'historical' account of the myth. Leaving aside for the moment the nature of myth, let us examine the nature of sin in relation to the conception of time which we have briefly sketched. Here one may begin with Sartre's analysis of consciousness. Following Husserl he posits consciousness as an activity of separation—consciousness is consciousness *of* something. We are compelled by our very nature to be cut off from—or rather to cut ourselves off from—the other. He describes this as a flight from being, a determination to be free of its contingency and its demands. What is the 'direction' of this flight? It is a flight into the *future*. We refuse the present, or, what we are, and substitute (or, manufacture) a future for ourselves wherein we are free, at least

from the demands of the present. The course of this temporality is thus intimately bound up with a kind of fundamental rejection of being, a determination to be other than that which we are *obliged* to be. This 'futurism', as Marcel might add, is a will for self or a determination to possess and a refusal to be for the other. In this sense, past-present-future temporality *is* the Fall. We turn our back on the 'presence' of God understood as the grace which regards and creates the other. We refuse the present because we are determined to possess and to have. The trajectory of our temporality is the witness to Original Sin. Its universality then needs no demonstration since we all live to some extent 'in the future'. Its inevitability moreover becomes self-evident in that temporality is manifestly the mode of our existence. The 'date' of the Fall is now not an awkward fact to be fitted in; it is implicit in the whole statement of the doctrine. It may be objected that there seems to be a 'temporality' in the objective world. In terms of the present discussion, however, we should maintain that this is, at the least, dubious. Events do have a *cause* and an *effect*, but to claim that they have a past or a future is, we should maintain, to hypostatise and read into their being the temporality of our own. This, as we have seen, is connected with an act of will. This is not to say that temporality is restricted to consciousness. There is *potential* temporality wherever there is being; but temporality originates as there is a wilful separation in the heart of being, whereby the eternity of presence is adulterated by the intrusion of future to produce, as a result, the mode of being we call temporality. It is more correct to say that what seems to be an *objective* feature of our environment is really a complex of innumerable acts of self-will, or, in other words, the solidarity of our fallen experience. Original Sin is to say, 'I *will* have the apple' and all the 'I shalls' of our life are witness to it. One asks, what is the date of the Fall. The answer is that *every* date, implying as it does temporality, is the date of the Fall. Whenever we think, feel, act in terms of past-'present'-future we are accepting our solidarity in the Fall. Would such an interpretation support the doctrine of total corruption? The fundamental rejection of the presence of God does imply that, while every man is not guilty of every possible actual sin, yet every man is so self-orientated that he has no thought or action which

is not conditioned by the futurism of having. Thus, for example the Law, understood in human terms, implies a future reward. All our human 'goodness' has a future dimension of having. Heaven is automatically situated in the future. Yet there is, in spite of all this, a sustaining grace of God which saves us from losing ourselves completely in the future. We deny the presence of God but He does not withhold Himself from us. We are granted moments of presence wherein we have intimations of a mode of being other than that of our normal temporality. Opportunities are given to us of *presenting* ourselves in service and love, and as we accept them we dimly realise the blessed possibility of there being another mode of being compared with which our present 'time' is an unreal distortion. While we constantly reject this, yet there do come to us unmistakable 'moments' when the clocks are forgotten. In moments of service, encounter, love, there is a witness to us in our fallen state of the eternal present of God. The full Christian answer of course is related to what Christ did for us. On the Cross, by His self-giving of love, by His obedience to the Father's will (or mode of Being), He broke the power of temporality as witness the Resurrection. Risen and Triumphant, He says to us, 'I am with you *always*'. He makes available that experience of 'living in the present' which we can never otherwise experience—because we always seek it in the future. By the power of the Holy Spirit we discover our present in expressing God's present love to our neighbour and forgetting about the future, i.e. about our own self-will.

What of the apologetic significance of this? In one sense Christianity is 'foolishness' and ultimately we are required to base all our theology on the 'foolishness of the Cross'. With Kierkegaard we need to 'crucify the intellect'. God requires of us a degree of intellectual obedience which admits fundamentally of no argument. Even in our biblical theology we are expected not so much to 'search the scriptures' as to believe in Him Whom God has sent. Christianity is propagated not by argument but by declaration and the prophetic strain must have priority. Yet because we are rational beings we need an apologetic. The intellect also needs to be evangelised. The task of the theologian is comparatively straightforward: he has to give an account of a belief. Once the belief is accepted

it is not an impossible task to give an account of it. The work of the apologist is more difficult, for he is required to establish the intellectual respectability of the Gospel without direct appeal to faith as his cornerstone. He has to find a common field of interest between theology and philosophy, or, as we say today, a common talking point. Many different talking points have been raised during this long conversation, but sooner or later the term, revelation, has to be mentioned and the discussion flags. We suggest that, instead of putting off this awkward point until some measure of agreement has been reached on the perimeter of the faith, we take the bull by the horns and be in with an examination of the nature of reason and revelation. At first sight they are poles apart. There is, however, a common enemy, temporality, and in dealing with this problem a discussion of tactics may be the occasion of a very fruitful apologetic. Both reason and revelation intend to overcome the *occasional* nature of experience. Both desire to transcend the 'temporal flux'. In both cases there is a search for the permanent. Here is a meeting place of philosophy and theology, which has the great advantage of being an actual and not an arbitrary location. Reason, reacting against temporality tries to establish what must *always* be true; revelation announces what has happened *once and for all*. Reason seeks permanence; revelation offers eternity. The former attempts to *abstract from* temporality; the latter, maintaining that the frustrations of temporality are of a moral nature, offers a share in the victory of eternity over time established by the Cross and Resurrection. The focus of the problem is the nature of the *present*. For reason, the present is at the heart of the problem of impermanence. If we have to 'locate' the present between past and future it diminishes to vanishing point and yet, on the other hand, empirical validity must be situated in present experience. In other words, the way to 'permanence' must be through the present, but, on examination, the present seems to be an arbitrary 'point' having its substance on loan from past and future. In the light of what we have said we may offer an alternative view. We suggest that the present has a moral significance. Starting from the fact that there is a 'sentiment' of the present which is qualitatively different from future and past, what is its significance? We find it variously described: by

James as the 'specious present', by Bergson as the 'present of attention', by Marcel as the location of moral effort, by Laberthonnière as creative effort, by Berdyaev as the moment of salvation. While all these attempts at description differ, they agree in that they give to the notion, present, some kind of moral content. There is, in the reality of presentness, a choice. We should describe this as a choice between being for oneself and being for the other. Accepting the former, our 'I will' sets off a process of futurism and our 'present' diminishes to vanishing point. Accepting the latter, we present ourselves in charity to the neighbour and the present becomes the point of entry into God's eternal present of His Self-giving. The habit of wilful futurism is so much a part of our fallen nature that it needs the special presence of God in Christ to realise for us the possibility of breaking the self-forged chain of what we have called absent-future-past, or what is usually called past-present-future. On the one hand, then, the present is a mere springboard of futurity, but on the other hand the present is the occasion of a moral and spiritual imperative bound up with the nature of love, understood as self-presentation.

The advantage of such a conversation is that it overcomes the main difficulty which is experienced in stating the traditional arguments, that is, the need for establishing satisfactorily the *nature* of God as well as His existence. The ontological argument claims to establish the existence of Perfect Being of whom we have the notion in our minds. The cosmological argument deduces a First Cause from the chain of cause-effect in the world. The moral argument posits a Government because of the universal acceptance of moral criteria in one form or another. Similarly with other proofs. In no case is the Being described, whether Perfection, Cause, Purpose, Government sufficient to be identifiable with the God and Father of our Lord. Even having established, for example, that there must be First Cause to account for the cause-effect network of experience one is led to question the validity of the capital letters. The problem still remains, how are we to identify a First Cause with the God of Christian revelation. The proof that we require must establish not only the existence of God but also His nature as revealed in Christ. We suggest that 'proof by time' may be more satisfactory here. Time is an

accepted condition of experience. The heart of both its elusiveness and its actuality is in the present. An examination of the present suggests that it is the locus of a moral choice. Evasion of the challenge to present oneself is the occasion of the fugitive and futurist nature of temporality; a full acceptance of this opportunity of presence, on the other hand gives intimations of a mode of being other than the temporal. This is fully realised in the Self-presentation of Christ. Thus not only is there evidence of God as Eternal Being but at the same time, the *nature* of eternity is understood as love, expressed as constantly being present.

THE ORIGINS OF BAPTISM[1]

by The Rev. Professor THOMAS F. TORRANCE

It is by no means an easy matter to trace the precise origins of the rite of Christian Baptism, both because there is a vast amount of material relevant to it, and because the New Testament does not seem to offer any one clear line for consideration. It takes all this for granted and speaks of Baptism quite naturally and without any difficulty of communication, and without any need for explanation. The derivation of the rite and the actions involved are everywhere presumed as familiar. That makes it all the more difficult for us, for we have to examine minutely the many allusions, hints and images employed in the New Testament writings, and in particular the references and citations (often very incomplete) from the Old Testament, in order to place ourselves as completely as possible in the position of the New Testament writers, and then from their *Sitz im Denken* as well as *Sitz im Leben*, seek to unravel their presuppositions and interpret their meaning.

Perhaps one of the most difficult things for us to do today, after a century of exhaustive Old Testament investigation, is to get ourselves into the position from which the New Testament writers regarded and interpreted and handled the Old Testament. Take, for example, the very extraordinary passage in the sixteenth chapter of Ezekiel. The interpretations of Old Testament scholars appear to differ widely among themselves, but they differ radically from that found everywhere in Rabbinic Judasim of the first three centuries A.D., e.g. in the older Pesikta. But how would the writers of the New Testament have interpreted it? One thing must be clear, that we cannot expect them to have understood it after the fashion of scientific Old Testament scholarship today. They did not have that sort of approach to the Old Testament and certainly did not have the equipment that requires. It is more likely that they would have looked at it as their Jewish contemporaries looked at it,

[1] Lecture delivered in the University of Lund, Oct. 1956. For the sequel to this see 'Aspects of Baptism in the New Testament', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 1958, 14.3.

as a parable of Yahweh's dealing with Israel after the fashion of Jewish adoption of a newly-born foundling child of heathen parents. In this way the parable was interpreted to speak of Israel as a child-proselyte from heathendom, baptised and cleansed and brought into the covenant, and then when she grew of age, assumed into the marriage-relationship. But alas, she proved unfaithful to her husband, who had entered into covenant with her. Taken in that way, it is certainly a remarkable parable of Israel adopted to be the child of Yahweh, sealed with the seal of the Covenant, and then in renewal of the Covenant espoused as the Bride of Yahweh. This double sealing of the Covenant was Rabbinically discerned in the reference in Ezekiel 16 to the two bloods, vv. 6, 9, 22, was interpreted to refer parabolically to circumcision and passover, and this very language is still used by Jews in the rite of circumcision.

Now that is quite definitely typical of Judaistic interpretation of the Old Testament during New Testament times, and we know that this passage and its interpretation played a fundamental part in the understanding of proselyte Baptism. Those incorporated by baptism into Israel were adopted into the Covenant in the same way that Israel itself was adopted by Yahweh. But can we say that the New Testament writers would have regarded Ezekiel 16 in this light? We have to allow for the fact that these interpretations repeated *ad nauseam* in the Rabbinic literature were embedded in the Jewish tradition and conditioned the Christian reading and interpreting of the Old Testament, but on the other hand, the interpretation of the Old Testament was decisively altered by the overwhelming and shattering fact of Christ, which drew to it all the lines of Old Testament teaching, fulfilling them and abrogating them in a sovereign manner. That is what makes it so difficult to get into the *Sitz im Denken* of the New Testament writers, to see how they looked at the Old Testament. They certainly looked at it from a Christian perspective. That did not mean that their Jewish tradition of interpretation was altogether destroyed. On the contrary, it was given reinterpretation and made to point forward in a new way to Christ. But just because all lines were now seen to point forward to Christ, the many lines made to converge on Him overlapped the nearer their point of con-

vergence. That is particularly evident in the way the New Testament writers use images from the Old Testament. They lay them on top of one another, and use several together in their effort to use the Old Testament to express their understanding of the salvation fulfilled in Christ. That usage extends even to Old Testament words and phrases and part-sentences, which are brought together sometimes within a single verse in the New Testament. That process of conflating images and terms was already at work in Judaism, but now in the fulfilment of the ancient promises in Christ that is done in a new way, and with a sovereign freedom in handling the Old Testament citations. The reality in Christ is not bound by the ancient shadow or image; that was only a signitive pointer to the reality, and now that the reality has arrived, it is interpreted, not by an arbitrary handling of the Old Testament, but by a significant and sovereign use of it, in which it is bent into subservience to the New.

In all this there is a tendency to go back direct to the Old Testament, to read it with new eyes, and the new insights imparted by the mighty events of the Gospel, but even so there could be no escaping from the oral Jewish tradition which for so long had shaped the reading and understanding of the Old Testament. Rather was this Jewish tradition itself taken under control and adapted in the reinterpretation of Israel in the Church. It is only when we get inside that complicated reorientation to the Old Testament and to Jewish interpretation of it, that we can discern the significance of so many of the allusions and references of the New Testament to the Old, and to Jewish tradition. It is in that light, for example, that Paul appears to make use of Ezekiel 16 in Ephesians 5.25ff, but if so, how radically different is his employment of Ezekiel 16 from that of Rabbinic Judaism, when he uses it to speak of the Baptism of the Church as the Bride of Christ.

That is but one important allusion offered in the New Testament to the origin of the rite of Baptism, but how are we to thread our way through the maze of allusions and references in this connexion? I believe that we may take our cue from the Judaistic conception of proselyte baptism. By that I do not mean at all that we are to see in proselyte baptism itself the source of the Christian rite, but that proselyte baptism helps

us to see a line of interpretation embedded in the Jewish tradition, which throws considerable light upon what the New Testament writers took for granted in regard to the origins of the Christian rite.

The firm use of proselyte baptism appears in Judaism in the middle of the second century; allusions to it appear frequently in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*. There are references to it also in the *Mishnah* which refer to the time when the Temple was still standing, but perhaps our oldest evidence for it comes from the New Testament, particularly from the Epistles of St. Paul, who appears to use the language of Proselyte Baptism, in 1 Cor. 10.1ff; 2 Cor. 5.17, 6.14ff, 7.1; Rom. 6.15ff; Eph. 2.11f, etc. Be that as it may, it is extremely difficult to conclude that the firm practice of proselyte baptism in the second century Judaism did not go back, like everything else, to authoritative sanctions in their tradition very much earlier, and that the written teaching of the second century did not have behind it a long oral tradition.

I do not say this in order to argue that Christian Baptism depends on or derives from proselyte baptism, but simply in order to make it clear that it is a legitimate procedure to examine the hints that proselyte baptism gives us of formative lines of interpretation at work in Judaism long before the firm practice of proselyte baptism was established, or its rite and meaning were clearly set forth in the tractate *Gerim*.

Proselyte baptism involved three main elements: *circumcision*, *the sprinkling of sin-offering water* on the third and seventh days after circumcision, and *ablution*. This was the rite of incorporation into the Covenant people, and of taking on the yoke of the Torah. Behind the rite lay a powerful theology of participation in the Exodus redemption out of Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, and of sanctificatory cleansing in the establishment of the Covenant at Mount Sinai. This is found with particular clarity in the *Pesikta*, and is still preserved in the Passover *Haggadah*. The 'proselyte' to Judaism, the *ger*, meant more than a proselyte in our sense of the word. Even the Greek sought to render the fact that he is one who may 'draw near' to worship God as one of His holy people, engaging in the holy things of law and cult. But the Hebrew *ger* has also a fundamental significance, as Nahum Levison has recently

pointed out (*S.J.T.* 10/1957, p. 45f), close to the word *hibri* or Hebrew, the one from the other side, a foreigner. Thus what was prescribed for the *gerim* in their incorporation into the *hibrim* throws a good deal of light upon the Hebrews as a covenant-people. It is in this respect that Ezekiel 16 surely has part of its far-reaching significance. On the other hand, incorporation into the *hibrim* must be one of the oldest and most telling ideas governing the conception of Baptism which it eventually demanded. By looking behind these rites incorporating *gerim* into the covenant-people, we can find considerable help in understanding the teaching of the New Testament.

(1) *Circumcision*

In the account offered by the Old Testament itself, this rite was given to Abraham and his family as *hibrim* in ratification of the Covenant and in seal of the divine promise attached to it, the promise of a country but also of a Messianic future. The promise of the land was not fulfilled for four hundred years, for the Hebrews were themselves to be *gerim* in the land of Egypt (Gen. 15.13). It was in connexion with the first Passover and the Exodus out of Egypt that the term *ger* seems to come into prominence in the Old Testament. There it is that we hear that the *ger* was to be circumcised (and all male members of his family), if he was to take part in the Passover. He was to come under the one Law of the one Covenant (Exod. 12.43-49). That is further elucidated in Leviticus 19, where it was prescribed that Israelites should love the *gerim* as they loved themselves, for they also were *gerim* in Egypt—'I am Yahweh, your God', it is added, for the whole worship of Yahweh was at stake in this matter.

There are two main points I would like to stress here.

(*a*) The relation of circumcision to the Messianic promise. Until the Hebrews entered the promised land, they too were *gerim*. That is a conception that came to the fore in the later literature of the Old Testament, exilic and post-exilic, when the Jews came to think of themselves as sojourners and aliens resident in a foreign country. They were essentially pilgrims expecting the Messianic country, the Messianic Kingdom. They were God's *gerim*, a thought particularly clear in the Psalms, where there is a return to the idea that they were

children of Abraham, waiting to take possession of the promised land. At the same time the status of the non-Israelite *gerim* came to be increasingly appreciated, as in Isaiah 56.3-5, which seems to have influenced the Zadokite community of Damascus and the allied community at Qumran. Thus at the height of the Old Testament teaching we have the important idea that the circumcised children of Abraham are messianically to be regarded as *gerim* expecting a country, expecting the fulfilment of the ancient promises of the Covenant.

(*b*) The Covenant cut into the flesh. In circumcision the Covenant was cut into the flesh of Israel as a sign and seal of its promised fulfilment. The Covenant was such that it had to be actualised in the whole life of Israel, enacted in its flesh, done into its existence before God. From the Deuteronomic literature onward this was given a deeper interpretation in terms of the circumcision of ears, lips, and heart—the whole 'inner man', so to speak, had to be circumcised. That is to say, the Covenant will of God had to be inscribed by His finger or by His Spirit upon the tablets of the heart. That idea came to prominence especially in Ezekiel and Jeremiah, but it is clear that when that took place, the writing of God's Word and Will in the heart through the operation of the Spirit, then the Old Covenant would take on a new form. It would be a New Covenant.

But how was this Covenant to be fulfilled in the flesh of Israel? How was it to be cut right into the existence of Israel, and so fulfilled from within Israel, wholly and completely fulfilled? The answer given by the Old Testament is found in the Deutero-Isaianic doctrine of 'the Servant of the Lord', He who will fulfill and mediate the Covenant. (I am myself convinced that while the Servant represents Israel in its ordeal, it has a further significance in which, without denial of the corporate character of the Servant, one Servant in the midst of Israel is indicated, and that here it is ultimately the figure of Moses, 'the servant of the Lord', that lies behind it.) The fulfilment of God's Word and Truth, His judgment and mercy, takes place in the life of the Servant, but in him it is vicariously fulfilled for all. In the later Isaianic prophecies we hear also of the Holy Spirit. The Servant is anointed with the Spirit and through Him the Spirit is bestowed. And in this connexion we

may also adduce the prophecies of Joel fulfilled on the day of Pentecost in the Baptism of the Spirit.

We are now in a position to gather up the results of this discussion and put it into New Testament language. Circumcision is fulfilled in the New Covenant, (*a*) in the blood of Christ, which is the blood of the New Covenant, that is in His total circumcision or crucifixion; and (*b*) in His gift of the Holy Spirit. With these two facts the Old Covenant no longer remains in force in the old form, and therefore the outward sign of it is abrogated or rather displaced by a sign appropriate to the fulfilled reality of the New Covenant in Christ. Here it is the Epistle of Galatians that is most instructive. If the Covenant remains in its old form, then, says St. Paul, what Christ has done is of no avail. But actually the whole relation between man and God has entered upon a new age in the New Covenant made by God in Christ. This is fulfilled once and for all in the breaking of the Body of Christ and in the shedding of His Blood, and in the outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh, that is upon all who enter into the New Covenant in the name of Christ. The sign of Baptism is therefore given to take the place of circumcision as the sign and seal of the New Covenant. It is applied to all who draw near in Christ and are incorporated into the Covenant people as 'pilgrims and sojourners', i.e. as Christian *gerim*.

(2) *The sprinkling of sin-offering water*, or the water of separation

The significance of this has been much neglected, no doubt because of its obscurity to Western minds. However, the fact that in the majority of cases where the word βαπτίζειν is used religiously in pre-Christian Jewish literature, it refers to this solemn cleansing by sprinkling, ought to be sufficient to indicate its importance in examining the background to the rite of Baptism. The commandments regarding this rite and the traditions connected with it, make it clear that it was one of the most solemn and awful rites in the Old Testament, except perhaps that of the high priest entering into the Holy of Holies once a year on the Day of Atonement, at the very risk of his life. It is important to realise, as Levison has pointed out anew, that the language used of it in the Old Testament is incredibly strong, *ḥatah*, meaning to *un-sin*. The language

used in the *Mishnah* indicates that in some sense it was thought of as a baptism of death, a death to sin. The rite involved the total burning by fire without the camp of a red heifer as a sin offering, and the preservation of its ashes which were to be used along with the sprinkling of water for un-sinning and sanctification on occasions of grave defilement. Some scholars, not without justification, regard the rite as an Israelite substitution for the pagan rite of 'passing through fire' children in sacrifice to Molech. That may well lie behind the incident recorded in Numbers 31, where the purification of Israel and their Midianite prisoners was to be effected through the water of separation or impurity, while the gold and silver, etc., captured were to be passed through fire. What could not endure the fire was to be made to pass through water, that is by means of this solemn sprinkling. Whatever the origin of the rite, cleansing by sin-offering water was a 'substitute rite' in place of a kind of baptism by fire.

Be that as it may, we find that the ordinance of separation and un-sinning was in this awful way applied to the *gerim* as well as to the Israelites. It was this that added awful solemnity to the circumcision of the proselyte, and made his coming from circumcision to be like 'coming from the grave' as the *Mishnah* puts it.

To see the deep significance of this it is worth looking at the rites ordained for the cleansing and readmission of lepers to fellowship in Israel. Lepers were separated and banished from common life as utterly unclean and were regarded as having no civil rights. Healed lepers, however, had to be readmitted through a double rite, a ceremony of reconsecration through a sevenfold sprinkling of the water of unsinning, remarkably parallel to that for the consecration to priesthood, enabling them to draw near to holy things, and a ceremony remarkably parallel to that of the Day of Atonement for the annual renewal of the Covenant between God and Israel. Only thus could a leper be reincorporated into the holy nation and priestly people of Israel. Something of that undoubtedly influenced Elisha in the commands he gave to Naaman, the Syrian leper, whose sevenfold baptism (the word *βαπτίζειν* is used in the LXX) corresponded to the sevenfold sprinkling of the leper.

It is in Psalm 51, however, that we see even more deeply into

its spiritual significance. David after his fearful sin regards himself as cut off from God and deprived of His Spirit, and prays for cleansing as if he had become a leper or a heathen. 'Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean: wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities. Create in me a clean heart, O God and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation and uphold me with a willing Spirit.' It was only then that he could draw near to offer the customary sacrifices upon God's altar.

It is significant that at important points in the Old Testament writings this language was used with profound spiritual and even Messianic significance. It was used by Ezekiel in his spiritual reinterpretation of circumcision, and above all in the important passage in 36.25 where the Messianic gift of a cleansing and quickening Spirit is spoken of as the sprinkling of clean waters, resulting in a new heart and a new spirit. 'And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers: and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.' Israel, regarded as still waiting to enter the promised land, is promised a fulfilment of God's Covenant made with Abraham, but a Covenant soon to be fulfilled in a new way through the Spirit. This passage was cited times without number in the Mishnaic and Talmudic literature of Judaism, but nowhere perhaps more significantly than at the end of the *Yoma* where it is adduced to give interpretation to the baptismal ablution of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, and to interpret that baptism messianically as 'the hope of Israel'.

Thus circumcision came to be reinterpreted in terms of a Messianic gift of the Spirit, but the association of the sprinkling of the water of separation added to that the idea of a baptism of the Spirit which was at once un-sinning and quickening. The association of this kind of baptism or sprinkling of the water of the Spirit with circumcision, and its messianic reinterpretation, can hardly be over-estimated, so far as the origins of the New Testament rite are concerned. It is of course the Epistle to the Hebrews which particularly points to this line

of tradition in the origin of the rite of Baptism. The Old Testament rites are regarded as fulfilled in Christ Himself the Mediator of a New Covenant, who like the red heifer, suffered in vicarious sacrifice without the camp, so that in Christ we may 'draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water'. The reinterpretation of the Old Testament rites in Christ does not mean the abolition of the use of water, but the language of the old rites is used to interpret the relation of this baptismal rite to Christ's fulfilment of the Covenant and His opening up for us a new and living way into the holy presence of God.

(3) *Ablution in Water*

Where did this rite come from and what was its significance? We know that the Near East abounded in 'baptist' movements at the turn of the era, and that even within Israel there were many sects practising baptismal ablutions, the best known of which were the Pharisees, who had a rite of initiation into the sect by immersion of the whole family including women and children, but who practised frequent and daily baptisms in which they carried late-Jewish purifications to absurd lengths. In Judaism, however, all these rites of baptismal ablution and purification seem to go back to the central rites associated with the Laver in the Tabernacle or the Sea in the Temple, at which washing in water was required by priests on entering or leaving the Holy place, and also before solemn sacrifice. Washing of the victims was also required, a fact which may be reflected in the action of Elijah on Mount Carmel. The particularly solemn act of ablution was that of the high priest at consecration (the only instance of baptism of one at the hands of another, i.e. of Aaron at the hands of Moses, unless Solomon was given a similar cleansing at the Gihon at his consecration to be king) and again on the Day of Atonement. It would appear that the placing of the Laver in the Temple was originally designed, or at least later interpreted, to represent symbolically the crossing of the Red Sea together with the sanctification of Israel for the service of God within the Covenant, just as the placing of the Tables of the Law in the Ark within the Holy of Holies appears to represent symbolically, and to

recall liturgically, the ascent of Moses to receive the Law in the thick darkness which shrouded the holy presence of God on Mount Sinai. At any rate the Laver did represent a liturgical extension into the worship of Israel of its sanctification and cleansing as a people taken into holy Covenant with God. When this sanctification and cleansing was applied to the proselyte, Judaism certainly interpreted it in an elaborate doctrine of the crossing of the Red Sea and the sanctification of Israel before Mount Sinai. Thus the application to proselytes of an act of immersion at the end of their initiation meant their participation in the mighty acts of Israel's redemption out of Egypt at the Exodus, their entry into the holy and priestly people of the Covenant, and their readiness through sanctification to receive instruction from the Law of God, and to come under its yoke. It meant that they shared in God's sanctification or hallowing of Himself in the midst of His people Israel, and separated themselves from the darkness and uncleanness of the heathen world to live within the light and purity of God's revelation and appointed way of life. In this way they took shelter in the Name of God and came under the wings of His Holy Spirit. Born again out of heathendom, they were new creatures, no longer aliens and strangers, but fellow-citizens of the commonwealth of Israel in the family of God.

When we turn from the Old Testament and its traditional interpretation to the New Testament, we are confronted right away with the Baptism of John the Baptist, and the Baptism of Jesus by John. Did this rite appear in entire independence of what we have been considering in the context of Jewish thought and practice? That is most unlikely. Then how are we to regard the distinctive characteristics of John's Baptism, and how are we to interpret them over against the tradition of prior and contemporary Judaism?

Here we are offered, it would appear, some real help from the so-called Dead Sea Scrolls, both in a general way, and at two particular points which seem to me to be important.

Generally these Judaean documents, and in particular the Manual of Discipline, along with the Zadokite Fragments from Damascus, use not only the language, but many of the ideas we have been discussing, such as spiritual circumcision, the sprinkling of sin-offering water for atonement Messianically inter-

preted, and the application of priestly ablution from the Temple to all initiated members of the Covenant Community. In all this circumcision itself falls into the background. Indeed there is no mention of it in the two documents named except in a spiritual sense. What is important is its fulfilment in the anointing of the Spirit and in the illumination of the Torah, which is accompanied by sprinkling and immersion. These rites are not regarded as efficacious in themselves, but as symbolic of the divine cleansing and justification. Atonement is by the Holy Spirit of God, apparently replacing the blood of the Covenant and all animal sacrifices. And of course it is supremely noteworthy that on the ground of such purification in water and Spirit, admission is given to the Messianic meal of bread and wine.

The attempts that have been made to draw close parallels between these ideas and practices and those of John the Baptist to prove their direct and immediate influence upon him are not convincing, but it is significant that here we have some justification for the general line of interpretation of the origins of the rite of Baptism we have been pursuing. If the documents in question are to be dated just prior to the fall of Jerusalem or even sometime within the first century, they do indicate clearly that there was within Judaism a remarkable development in reinterpreting the Old Testament, similar to that which appears to lie behind the pages of the New Testament, a development which was radically and critically reinterpreted once again in the light of the mighty acts of God in Christ. The parallels between the conceptions embedded in the New Testament and those in these sectarian communities at Qumran and Damascus, help us to understand the change that took place in Jewish Christianity as it emerged out of Judaism, although they do not supply us with actual source-material governing that change.

There are two particular points that demand closer consideration.

(*a*) Although the *gerim* are mentioned as a distinct group of novitiates in the Covenant Community by the Damascus document, and may well be implied in the Manual of Discipline, in both of them all members of the Covenant Community admitted by baptismal lustration and covenantal oath-taking

tended to be regarded as proselytes to the Lord, or converts to the New Covenant. The term used is *nilwim*, taken from Isaiah 56.3, 6, to describe 'Messianic *gerim*', as it were. Here Israelites are somehow looked on as polluted and unclean like lepers, so that solemn purification is absolutely necessary. Hence the solemn cleansing applied to lepers and to those polluted by death, and to the high priest on the Day of Atonement, is applied to them. In other words, it is no longer sufficient to be a circumcised Jew. All have to undergo repentance and purification, circumcised Jews and proselytes alike; they have to become converted as members of the Messianic Community and as participators in the New Covenant. (It is also interesting to note that the Damascus Document refers to the idea, common also in Rabbinic literature, that Abraham was a proselyte, even in the narrower sense of the word.)

(*b*) Along with this there is apparent a reaction against a crude and literalist practising of the Cult in favour of an attempt to translate the priestly Cult into the actual life and existence of the Covenant people. Thus the structural pattern of the Tabernacle or Temple seems to be transferred to 'the Community of the New Covenant' or 'the Covenant of friendship' (*berith ḥesed*), as Brownlee has translated it. Through their initiatory rites the people were shaped into a unity and were regarded as building together a sort of living Temple of people, a 'House of Holiness' with its Holy of Holies, Holy Place, and its Outer Court for Israelites, and in the Zadokite Document from Damascus, also a fourth peripheral group apparently corresponding to the outer Gentile precincts of the Temple. Moreover, priestly ablution and the priestly ephod were extended to all covenanted members of the Community now regarded as a sort of corporate priesthood of 'the anointed ones'. In other words, here we have an attempt by rigorous discipline to carry out what I have called the requirement that the Covenant Will of God must be done into the very life and existence of Israel.

We are of course at once reminded of the teaching of the New Testament, notably of Paul and 1 Peter, of the Church as the Habitation of God, the Temple of the Spirit, as the Holy People or House of God built up of living stones, but here in the New Testament there is a radical difference: the living

Temple is above all the Body of Jesus Christ, and His Body in two senses: in reference to Christ Himself, and in reference to the Church of Christ which He adopts in His grace to be His Body. In other words, the difference between the conception of the Covenant Community in the documents of Qumran and Damascus and the Christian conception, is that the Church is the people of the New Covenant only because of and on the ground of the fact that the Covenant has actually been fulfilled in Jesus Christ, who gathers up Israel in Himself and is the beginning of a New Israel embracing all who are gathered into the Name of Christ and are baptised by His Spirit. It is in and through Jesus Christ and by the power of His Spirit that the Covenant Will of God is at last enacted into the existence of God's people. Baptism is therefore into His Name, for He is the Mediator of the New Covenant, but 'into His Name' includes also the Name of the Father and the Spirit, for the Covenant He mediates is that in which God wills to be our Father and determines us to be His Children, and the nature of this Covenant is spiritual, that is one which is inscribed in our hearts by the Spirit of God Himself.

PASTORAL COUNSELLING AND TRADITIONAL THEOLOGY

By The Rev. DONALD D. EVANS

Is there a conflict between the principles of pastoral counselling and traditional Christian theology?

In discussing this question, I shall consider Carroll A. Wise' *Pastoral Counselling*[1] as a representative statement of counselling principles. What I mean by 'traditional' theology will, I hope, become reasonably clear in the course of the essay.

I shall try to show that, although the principles of pastoral counselling seem to be intimately bound up with various assumptions of a non-traditional or 'psychologistic' theology, one does not have to accept such a theology in order to use the principles.

For the sake of brevity I shall present the main issues in a schematic fashion. I shall consider three basic assumptions of Wise'[2] 'psychologistic' theology and in each case: (*a*) outline the assumption, (*b*) discuss the way in which it conflicts with traditional Christian theology, and (*c*) discuss whether the counselling principle which Wise links with his theological assumption can be used, with or without modification, by a pastor holding more traditional views.

1. (*a*) Wise holds that the judgment of God is a purely natural process in which those whose lives run counter to the natural laws of the universe suffer as a consequence.[3] Furthermore, he suggests that to recognise the judgment of God is to recognise this process operating in a concrete situation; it need not involve recognising the disapproval of a supernatural Person.[4] Hence it is not for the minister to express disapproval, or to convey God's disapproval[5]; the natural processes of the world have done all the 'judging' that is required.

[1] Carroll A. Wise, *Pastoral Counselling, Its Theory and Practice*, Harper and Bros., New York, 1951. Unless otherwise indicated, all footnotes refer to pages in this book.

[2] In a later book, *Psychiatry and the Bible* (Harper and Bros., N.Y., 1956), Wise reveals a somewhat modified theology, which I shall indicate in footnotes.

[3] p. 82. [4] p. 90. [5] p. 167.

(*b*) Traditional theology has generally held that natural law is not the only way in which God's judgment is carried out; divine intervention is also a dreadful possibility. This, however, is not the most important point here. For many Christian pastors who would agree[1] with Wise as to the *method* of divine judgment would differ strongly concerning its *meaning*. They would hold that God does disapprove of evil men and their actions, and that this is what divine judgment essentially means, whether the method of judgment be natural law or divine intervention. And it is the minister's job, on occasion, to warn men of God's disapproval, to help them to see their wrongdoing not merely as a violation of a moral law which brings painful consequences, but as a breaking of a personal relation with God. In this the minister follows the example of the prophets, Jesus and the early Church, who warned[2] men of divine judgment in the sense of divine disapproval. Wise supports[3] his case by citing certain stories (e.g. the woman taken in adultery), and ignoring others.

(*c*) The counselling principle which Wise here reinforces by his theology is that of *acceptance*; the counsellor must accept the person being counselled so that the latter will feel free to give expression to his feelings without fear of moral judgment; thus he will eventually find release and healing.

This is a standard principle of modern psychotherapy and it has been shown to have great therapeutic power.[4] I submit that the Christian minister ought to make use of it, as part of his perhaps neglected healing ministry. But he will have some reservations concerning its use, if his theology is traditional. The approach used in particular counselling situations is not necessarily to be used in all pastoral work, as Wise seems anxious to insist.[5] Like Jesus, we ought to adjust our message to each particular situation so that it will always be most relevant and helpful. Where some individuals, for example Zacchaeus, needed support and acceptance, he provided it. Indeed, most of His warnings, rebukes and condemnations were addressed

[1] E.g. C. H. Dodd, *Romans*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1932, pp. 21ff.
[2] E.g. Jer. 7.13; Matt. 21.13; Rev. 3.16. [3] p. 11.
[4] Concerning this, see D. Snygg and A. W. Combs, *Individual Behaviour*, Harper and Bros., New York, 1949, pp. 311-14.
[5] p. 45. In *Psychiatry and the Bible*, however, he rejects excessive 'permissiveness' in child training, since the child needs to learn what patterns of behaviour are 'acceptable' (p. 97).

to groups of people rather than to individuals, which perhaps provides a clue to any counsellor who is also a preacher. Christian love means seeking the best that is possible for people in their concrete life-situations. Sometimes this may involve acceptance, sometimes condemnation. Our criterion for deciding which it shall be is not a set of abstract principles, but the individual's particular need as a potential son of God.

It is important to realise that condemnation need not involve rejecting another person—it need not mean refusing to associate with him, 'writing him off', or losing all interest or love or hope for him. Acceptance is one expression of Christian love; disapproval may be another. Expression of disapproval may, of course, be a way of asserting power over another, or projecting our own guilt; it may have neurotic origins. Any pastor who is rebuking an individual or a congregation should ask himself, 'Do I enjoy doing this? Does it give me a feeling of satisfaction and importance? What are my motives?' There is a great difference between self-righteous judgment and self-identification with the loving disapproval of God who is in anguish over the sins of His people; and it is easier to be a Pharisee than a Jeremiah. Furthermore, a Christian must refrain from any judgment as to a person's ultimate status before God; this, and the fact that loving disapproval does not involve rejection, is what lies behind the maxim, 'Judge the sin, but not the sinner.'

Thus 'acceptance', as a counselling principle meaning 'absence of moral judgment', can be used by a pastor who maintains a traditional theology, provided it is not made into a universal rule for all human relations. And, at a deeper level, where 'acceptance' is considered to be the opposite of rejection and synonymous with 'love', it is of course the ideal for all human relations. It is important to distinguish these two meanings of 'acceptance'. The first (absence of moral judgment) refers to one way, among several ways, in which the second (love) may be expressed in concrete life-situations.

One final point, small but important: When a person seeks out a clergyman rather than a secular counsellor for assistance, he is usually well aware of divine disapproval[1] already, and

[1] Cf. O. S. Walters, 'The Minister and the New Counselling', *Journal of Pastoral Care*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 199-200.

tends to see the clergyman as the representative of this disapproval. Therefore (and in this sense Wise is correct) no more judgment is required. The man needs reassurance of God's forgiveness and acceptance (in the deeper sense of the word); he may need release from neurotic guilt before true repentance towards the righteous God can take place.

2. (*a*) Wise describes insight, whether religious or non-religious, as an experience in which we apprehend the dynamic processes within our personality in relation to each other and to other people[1]; the interpretation of this experience, i.e. the way we talk or think about it, is of secondary importance.[2] Indeed, the truly mature person has no need for 'rationalisation in terms of religious ideas'.[3] The reality which is grasped by the experience of insight is understood, not by an interpretation given it, but by an inner change of emotional attitudes.[4] The external explanation, interpretation or description of the reality thus grasped is at best a convenient pointer to it.[5] More frequently, it is an over-rigid framework[6] which distorts one's insight into the dynamic process which has taken place.

(*b*) Traditional Christianity differs from this in two important ways. It does not speak of human insight or discovery, but of divinely-initiated revelation to which there may be a human response; thus the idea of divine authority is necessarily involved.[7] Secondly, it insists that 'the biblical forms of speech . . . are a frame of reference which belongs to the substance of revelation'.[8] That is, Jesus was a man who had supreme experiences of insight which He interpreted in such a way as to express what had happened within Himself; but He was more than this, and believed[9] that He was more. He was convinced that His message or 'interpretation' was not only an expression of His inner experience but a *description* of an Other, God in Himself, and in His relation to the world. He was convinced that this description was in itself part of God's self-revelation. Thus Jesus provided His disciples with a nucleus of interpre-

[1] pp. 117-18. [2] p. 160. [3] p. 199.
[4] p. 119. [5] pp. 219-20. [6] p. 115.

[7] In *Psychiatry and the Bible*, Wise stresses the fact that both human and divine actions are involved in revelation. But he does not consider the question of divine authority which then arises (pp. 5, 15, 16).

[8] L. S. Thornton, *Revelation and the Modern World*, Dacre Press, A. & C. Black, London, 1950, p. 147.

[9] See A. M. Hunter, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, S.C.M., London, 1950.

tation of His own person and actions in relation to God, and this nucleus was expanded by the early Church,[1] which believed that both Jesus and this way of understanding Jesus were of the substance of revelation.

This interpretation of the nature of God, or the spiritual environment in which we live, has for the traditional believer the authority of God behind it; it is *true*. Of course, I may accept it merely with my mind and without any drastic inner change of emotional attitudes, so that my belief is true but not *genuine*. This is a danger of which modern psychotherapy makes us acutely aware, because its primary interest concerning religion is in the genuineness of beliefs and the therapeutic value of religious ideas. And as Christian pastors we ought also to be aware of the danger, for the goal of the Christian life is to make one's true belief completely genuine, eliminating all conflict and disparity between creed and conduct, mind and heart. One tries to relate one's inner dynamism to the real spiritual environment (i.e. the risen Christ) in such a way that the biblical interpretation of our situation becomes more and more real and personally meaningful. Thus one may achieve genuineness, or the integration of conceptual interpretation with personal experience and disposition.

But a traditional pastor cannot regard such integration as a sufficient ideal in his work among men, for he believes that the truth about God has been revealed in the actions and interpretative words of Jesus. The Christian Gospel is not merely a genuine expression of the religious experience of a particular group of men; it describes the true religious facts for all men.

For traditional Christianity, moreover, the Christian Gospel is not only true; it is also powerful in producing insight as it changes human personality. Wise tends to depreciate[2] the dynamic role of traditional Christian concepts in creating religious insight. He rightly emphasises the importance of individual human experience and motivation in influencing the individual's interpretation of his spiritual environment, and

[1] C. H. Dodd, in *According to the Scriptures* (Nisbet and Co., London, 1952, pp. 133-5), argues that St. Paul did not base his doctrine primarily on his own personal religious experience, however sublime, but on the historical tradition which he had received concerning Jesus, and the biblical framework of interpretation suggested by Jesus.

[2] p. 220: 'Religious experience produces the interpretation; the interpretation never produces the experience.'

his response to the Christian interpretation. But, compared with traditional theology, he minimises the creative power of the Christian interpretation, the word of God, in shaping the individual's experience and motivation. In religious thinking (as in other thinking),[1] there is an intimate interdependence between experience and interpretative framework.

(*c*) The counselling principle which Wise supports with his psychologistic view of 'interpretation' is the principle of *non-direction*; the counsellor should not direct the person being counselled towards any particular kind of interpretation of his experience, for the interpretation must arise spontaneously from the person counselled himself, or it may be merely a means of repressing his real inner desires.

As in the case of 'acceptance', it seems to me that the counselling principle is objectionable to traditional theology only when it is advocated as a way to help people in all situations. But where a person is in a situation of psychological threat and accepts only those interpretations which enable him to evade his real problem, it is usually useless and sometimes dangerous to present Christian doctrine. Non-directive therapy may help him to gain the self-knowledge which leads to mental health and maturity; pastors may use it as part of their ministry of healing in such cases. When this stage is reached, there is a place for rational discussion or persuasion concerning doctrine.[2] The traditional 'kerygma' presented with eloquence and love, may help even a very immature person to achieve considerable insight, though non-directive counselling will often be more helpful for people of that sort. This is a point concerning which ministers will naturally differ to some extent. But most traditionally-minded pastors will surely agree that, on the one hand, non-directive counselling is the best way to help some people, and that, on the other hand, the principle of non-direction ought not to govern all a minister's relations with other people.

The success and importance of non-directive counselling

[1] Cf. L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, tr. by C. E. M. Anscombe, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1953.

[2] Cf. Wise, p. 141: 'Interpretation must come after the experience. For example, after a person has worked through feelings of guilt and found release, the pastor may point out that the Christian faith has talked about such experiences as confession and forgiveness.'

are also a reminder of several facts which ought to be borne in mind by those who are attached to traditional theology:

(i) Theology, however orthodox and systematic, does not provide detailed answers or solutions to all particular problems of sin and guilt and fear and immoral behaviour. Our reluctance to *reduce* theological truth to mere expressions of individual human experience must not mean a refusal to *relate* it to this experience. 'It is only provisionally, and for the sake of a special purpose, that the divine source of revelation can be referred to apart from the human conditions under which revelation is received.'[1] In particular, we should appreciate not only the truth of the Christian Gospel, but also its therapeutic value, and its relation to the discoveries of psychotherapy.

(ii) Authoritative presentations of doctrine may be expressions of a quasi-neurotic or neurotic desire to dominate people; in this they are like sermons of moral judgment. Extreme emphasis on the formulation and inculcation of doctrine may be a way of trying to escape from unresolved personal problems, within oneself, or in relations with others. It must be added, however, that Wise is surely wrong in not distinguishing this from a non-neurotic sense of responsibility for preserving and teaching the apostolic faith. Is it always and unreservedly true that 'the emotionally mature religious worker will be able to allow the person freedom to work out his own religious faith'?[2] Surely it is true only in the sense that the mature pastor, when he presents Christian doctrine to a person, will not employ any extraneous pressure, but leave him free to accept or reject.

(iii) Non-directive counselling at its best requires an emptying of oneself so that one can reflect another's deepest feelings and enter into them, opening oneself to his suffering and weakness. In this, Christians have the example of the Son of God who 'emptied himself' in order to identify Himself with humanity; and we have the ultimate assurance that God's power will sustain us when we attempt in our small way to do likewise. And, in our faith, we have something to offer to those dedicated psychotherapists who attempt it without such assurance, and who deserve our admiration and our prayers.

We have considered two counselling principles, 'acceptance'

[1] David E. Roberts, *Psychotherapy and the Christian View of Man*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1950, p. 153.

[2] p. 220.

and 'non-direction'. There are others, but these are among the fundamental. At any rate, they do raise problems for traditional theology in the most obvious way, because of their intimate association with non-traditional theology.

I have tried to show, however, that if these principles are not claimed to have universal application in all the work of the minister, they can and ought to be used at times by ministers whose convictions are traditional. The principle of acceptance or absence of moral judgment provides the best method for expressing Christian love, in the traditional sense, to certain people in particular situations. Similarly, the principle of non-direction can be understood and sanctioned in terms of the traditional idea of 'emptying oneself', to help others who need that particular sort of help.

Moreover, both principles remind us of possible dangers in judgmental or authoritative preaching, and of the need to relate theological truth to a person's actual experience and situation.

In short, these principles are not only compatible with traditional theology, but also extremely relevant to it, and ought not to be ignored.

'HE WAS SEEN OF CEPHAS'

A SUGGESTION ABOUT THE FIRST RESURRECTION APPEARANCE TO PETER

by RUPERT ANNAND

It seems worth considering whether in the Emmaus story we have the missing account of Jesus' special Appearance to Simon Peter, which Mark foreshadows[1] before his Gospel breaks off and which Paul recalled[2] in the earliest list of Resurrection Appearances of all ('He was seen of Cephas').

If so, the fact that Simon Peter was Cleopas' companion on the journey to Emmaus has been quite obliterated. We could not infer it from Luke's Gospel as we have it, for 'Simon' is only named once—at the end. And all the manuscripts except one, the valuable Codex Bezae, tell the story in a way which, far from associating Simon with Cleopas, seems to separate them beyond all question, in the well-known passage quoted here:

> And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the Eleven gathered together and them that were with them, *saying*[3] 'The Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared to Simon.' And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in the breaking of the bread.[4]

The Codex Bezae on the other hand alters the meaning of the passage entirely by making the two travellers the subject of the word '*saying*'[5]; and this may be the clue which explains, as we shall see, how it came about that Peter's presence with Cleopas was obliterated. The Greek in the Codex Bezae is awkward, but the sentence implies that *Cleopas* announced that the Lord had indeed risen and that He had fulfilled his prophecy of appearing to Simon.

It has always been hard to think that Luke included a leisurely account of the Emmaus Story, and alluded to an important appearance to Simon Peter only in a kind of editorial aside. The words about the Resurrection and Simon do not

[1] Mark 16.7.
[2] 1 Cor. 15.5.
[3] *Legontas*.
[4] Luke 24.33-35.
[5] *Legontes*.

fit well into the mouths of the Eleven, for the Disciples are utterly taken aback by the appearance of Jesus which immediately followed. (They had refused to believe the women (Luke 24.) and it seems clear that they were convinced only when they saw Jesus for themselves.) Some scholars indeed argue that the details of Peter's experience were not known to Luke because they had been forgotten; but this seems most unlikely in view of the hints by Paul and Mark. And the Christian belief that the Resurrection took place on the third day is really bound up with the witness of Peter, the Rock on which the Church was founded. And so the possibility that it was Simon Peter who was with Cleopas at Emmaus seems worthy of serious examination.

Two of the early Fathers have left passages which seem to have a definite bearing on the theory.

First, the North African Christian Apologist, the lawyer Tertullian (circa A.D. 150-220) refers to the Emmaus story in a context which implies that one of the Twelve was involved (and not Cleopas and another minor character).

> They (our opponents) are accustomed to say that the *Apostles* did not know all things . . . (or again that the *Apostles* did indeed know all things but did not hand on all things to all). . . . Was anything hidden from Peter who was called the Rock whereon the Church should be founded . . . who obtained the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven? Was any knowledge withheld from John the most beloved disciple of the Lord . . . to whom alone the Lord pointed out Judas as the traitor . . .? Of what could He have meant those (i.e. Peter, James and John) to be ignorant to whom He even showed His own glory with Moses and Elias and the Father's voice moreover from Heaven . . .? *And were they ignorant to whom also after His Resurrection He deigned to 'expound all the Scriptures' as they journeyed?*
>
> (*De Presc. Haer.*, 22)

Tertullian is the first Christian writer outside the New Testament, I believe, to refer to the Emmaus incident and his evidence may reflect the accepted view of his age.

The company in which the Emmaus pair are here included suggests that Cleopas or his companion was one of the Twelve, if not one of the three leaders. Simon Peter is referred to twice in Tertullian's list. He may also have been pointed to as the companion of Cleopas.

This unsuspected possibility becomes more evident when we set Tertullian's passage alongside two references by one of his

contemporaries, the learned Origen of Alexandria (A.D. 186-253). Twice in the treatise *Against Celsus* Origen names a *Simon* as Cleopas' companion (and he names him *before* Cleopas, as if Simon was the older or the more important man). And Origen writes here, not as a scholar revealing a secret or offering a tentative conjecture of his own, but as one who reminded his readers of an accepted fact. The two passages run as follows:

> And in Luke's Gospel, when *Simon and Cleopas* were talking to one another about all that had happened to them, Jesus drew near to them and went with them; and their eyes were holden that they should not know him. (*Against Celsus*, 262)

(And again)

> It is not impossible for the divine nature that Jesus should disappear whenever he wished. . . . For it is written in Luke's Gospel that after the Resurrection Jesus took bread and broke it and gave it to *Simon and Cleopas*. And when they took the bread, their eyes were opened and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight. (*Against Celsus*, 268)

Now Simon was a common name; but it seems fair to argue that Origen here had the prince of Apostles in mind. Otherwise he must have added a further title. But from where did Origen draw his information? We may infer that the copy of Luke which he used at Alexandria or Caesarea contained not our present text but a reading and interpretation of the appearance to Simon which the Codex Bezae preserved: we may argue that the pair said that Jesus had appeared to them and they were disbelieved. There is support for this in the Longer Ending of Mark ('After that he appeared . . . unto two of them . . . *neither believed they them*' (Mark 16.12).) But I would hold over examination of this till later in the essay.

Zahn suggested that the Simon whom Origen named was another Simon known to the early Church, the son of the Lord's Uncle *Clopas*, who followed James the Just as head of the Jerusalem community.[1] But this suggestion seems to follow a false clue; for Origen places Simon first; and it was not customary in the ancient world to list a son before his father, however famous the son was.

Creed rejects altogether the tradition that Cleopas' companion was called Simon, as he also dismisses the difficult reading in the Codex Bezae (which, if genuine would support

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, 3.12.

it). But Creed was impressed by the value of the evidence of the Longer Ending of Mark which I referred to above.

Some of the difficulties of the Emmaus story would be explained if Luke took it over almost complete from an Aramaic source. And there are some indications of this. The opening ('And behold, . . .') suggests a Jewish background which reminds us of the two opening chapters of Luke's Gospel. And the story is told from a purely Jewish angle. Jesus is spoken of as a man, a Prophet. 'They had hoped that He was the Messiah; but His death has proved that this hope was an error' (Montefiore). It may be a sign of how Luke held closely to his source that he here refers to Peter as 'Simon'[1]; for after the call of the Twelve Luke's Gospel invariably has the name 'Peter' except in one Logion ('Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat . . .'[2]). The suggestion is that Luke found in his source Peter's earlier name '*Simon*' used and that he retained it. Another Semitism in the story is claimed to be '*Appeared* to Simon'—the same Greek word *ōphthē* in Paul's list to the Corinthians (a believed quotation from an Aramaic source, rather than Paul's own composition).

One objection against my theory that the Emmaus story was the Appearance to Simon Peter would appear to be that Cleopas and his companion, on coming back to Jerusalem, found 'the *Eleven*' gathered together. We should surely expect to read 'the *Ten*'—excluding Judas—if Peter returned with Cleopas? But the varying traditions about Judas' end shows that there was some doubt about what happened to the traitor after the Crucifixion; and Paul's reference in Corinthians to the Appearance to 'the *Twelve*'[3] (and the fact that some manuscripts read there 'the Eleven'—an early 'improvement' in the text, as it is thought) may be another example of the early confusion about Judas. The reference therefore to 'the Eleven' in the Emmaus story does not necessarily shut out the possibility that Simon Peter was Cleopas' unnamed companion. It seems not improbable that it was doubt about the mention of the Eleven here which caused the revision throughout the Church of the reading '*Legontes*' (Codex Bezae) so that the link between Emmaus and Peter was lost.

For us today the importance of the Appearance at Emmaus is

[1] Luke 24.34. [2] Luke 22.31. [3] 1 Cor. 15.5.

that it happened, according to Luke, 'on the third day', the same day as the visit of the women to the tomb. The Church insisted from the beginning that Jesus rose again on the third day and this must tell in favour of the genuineness of the story. For this persistent belief cannot rest only on a reading back into Old Testament prophecies and it did not originate with the finding of the empty tomb. The historical faith which spread so rapidly through the Roman Empire seems to demand an origin in some spiritual experience in or near Jerusalem, if we are to take into account the factor of 'the third day'. For Galilee is too far from Jerusalem to give time for the journey north, and for a first Appearance there.

How then are we to explain the tradition supported by the Gospel of Mark that after the Crucifixion the disciples returned to their homes in Galilee where they were to see the risen Jesus? This tradition, supported by Matthew, and also by the last chapter of John[1] and by the Gospel of Peter, was in the field before Luke's version. And it seems possible that one detail of the Emmaus story attempts to explain and correct the earlier tradition: when the risen Jesus 'made as though he would have gone further' than Emmaus, the story may be seeking to explain a change in the immediate fulfilment of Jesus' prophecy that after His Resurrection He would 'go ahead' of his disciples and meet them in Galilee.

It would be a help if we knew the whereabouts of Emmaus but we do not. It is generally assumed that Cleopas and his companion were returning home after the Festival. But there is no indication that they lived at Emmaus itself. And it is just as probable that Jesus' followers were pilgrims returning to Galilee and that Emmaus was the first caravanserai on one of the routes north from Jerusalem. It seems that it was at an inn that Jesus acted as host and blessed the meal.

In place of *Emmaus* the Codex Bezae has *Oulammaous*, a fact which may show that there was an early corruption in the text. For we find also that three of the Old Latin Manuscripts[2] turned Emmaus from a place name into a man's name, writing of *Ammaus* and *Cleop(h)as*. There is also an unexplained comment by the Latin Father Ambrose on Luke 24.18 (quoted by Creed): 'Alter Amaon alter Cleophas dicuntur' ('One of the

[1] John 21.1 f.

[2] b, e, and ff[2].

two is called Amaon and the other Cleopas'); it seems possible that the unfamiliar *Amaon* might be a corruption of *Simeon* (i.e. Simon). Abbreviations in early manuscripts were sometimes misread. It is also worth noting that there is a certain resemblance between *Cleophas* and the *Hebrew* form of Peter, *Cephas*. This also might throw light on the original confusion. But these are speculations which do not affect the core of the position argued in this essay.

Let me summarise the main points put forward earlier;

(*a*) Luke preserved in the Emmaus story a tradition from a primitive Jewish source.

(*b*) The parallel story in the Longer Ending of Mark shows a variant tradition which stresses the unbelief of the disciples (a fact which suggests their ignorance up to that point of any Appearance to Peter).

(*c*) Rather more than a hundred years after Luke wrote, Tertullian alluded to the incident in a context which implied that it was concerned with a leading Apostle—that is Simon Peter, John or James—because he classified it with occasions like the Transfiguration when Jesus shared special secrets with His closest followers.

(*d*) Evidence pointing in the same direction comes from Origen who, independently of Tertullian, understood it to be a Resurrection Appearance to Simon and Cleopas.

I would end by suggesting that the Longer Ending of Mark provides unnoticed scriptural authority for Tertullian's belief that an Apostle was involved. For unless the stories there summarised came from different sources, the Ending reveals that '*the residue*' (οἱ λοίποι) were '*the Eleven*' only after they had been joined by 'the two' from Emmaus (one of the Twelve and Cleopas?).

> And after that he appeared in another form unto *two of them* as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it to *the residue*; neither believed they them. Afterwards He appeared unto *the Eleven* as they sat at meat . . .[1]

Mark's Longer Ending shows a knowledge of traditions found in Luke and John, but it appears to be independent of both. Its evidence that the two who returned from Emmaus were not believed by the rest is a strong indication that the story in

[1] Mark 16.12.

Luke's Gospel (as we have it) has suffered some mishap. It seems possible that some of the Western group of manuscripts are here nearer to Luke's original version and represent the readings which were current around A.D. 200 in the time of Tertullian and Origen. The Codex Bezae itself favours the view that the Emmaus story contains the missing Appearance to Simon Peter. At present there is naturally a tendency to think that Cleopas was the more important of the two travellers to Emmaus. If this is a mistake caused by a change in the text, then Luke's Emmaus story provides more evidence of the history of the development of first-century Christianity than we imagined.

Note on the Resurrection Appearances in John

The Galilee tradition may prove to be a relic of the preaching of the early days when the Jerusalem Church controlled and censored the preaching message; just as the Synoptists' silence about Jesus' ministry in Judaea seems to be a reminder of Jewish hostility and the difficulties which the Christian Jews living in Jerusalem had to face in the early days, when they were closely linked with the Temple and the old faith. From the earliest times there was a secret tradition of a kind, a *disciplina arcani*, as J. Jeremias has reminded us. This included the Eucharist and may have also extended to the Resurrection Appearances. I would suggest that it was only after the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 that the open proclamation of the Jerusalem stories became possible and began to supersede the Galilee Resurrection Appearances. If true, this would explain why in Rome the original end of Mark's Gospel was destroyed; while in Syria, the home of the First Gospel, the Galilee tradition persisted, owing to a sense of local pride as it were.

Best of all, the theory offers a new interpretation of the two streams of tradition found in the last two chapters of the Fourth Gospel. The last chapter containing the Galilee Appearance is at present universally accepted as a later addition to the original Gospel; but there is no manuscript evidence to show that the Gospel ever existed without it. If in fact the Galilee tradition was the first to spread, as on the evidence of Mark is generally agreed, then a new theory about the composition of the last two chapters of the Fourth Gospel seems also possible. The writer, 'John', may first have written the story of the Appearance at the sea of Tiberias to Simon Peter and the others (which still reads like a *first* Appearance, as P. Gardner-Smith pointed out) which fitted after 20.10 ('Then the disciples went away again unto their own home' (Galilee?)). Then later, when the Jerusalem tradition was disclosed (some time after the Fall of Jerusalem as I believe) this ending needed revision just as Mark's did; and 'John' inserted the stories of three Appearances at Jerusalem (to Mary Magdalene and to the disciples in the upper room) and added the editorial linking material. As J. Weiss pointed out, there is reason to believe that Thomas' cry, '*My Lord and my*

God', helps to date the writing of the close of chapter 20 in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96), the first Emperor to claim divine honours. With similar arrogance he availed himself, when he dictated decrees, of the following words: '*Our Lord and God* commands as follows . . .' (Suetonius, *Domitian*, 13)

Thomas' words were a direct Christian challenge to the Emperor's claim; and it is tempting to conclude that the Fourth Gospel circulated at first as a secret document in view of this treasonable opposition to the State Religion.

BOOK REVIEWS

Subject and Object in Modern Theology. By James Brown. S.C.M. Press, London, 1955. Pp. 214. 18s.

Religious Language. By Ian T. Ramsey. S.C.M. Press, London, 1957. Pp. 191. 18s.

Two exceedingly urgent questions for contemporary theology are discussed in both of these books. The first is 'What is the relation of faith to historical fact?', and the second, 'What is meant by the claim of religious faith to objectivity?', or, stated in the formal mode, 'What is meant by the claim that statements of faith or Christian doctrine are true?'

The first question was raised in all its urgency by Kierkegaard, though not satisfactorily answered by him, and has been debated chiefly by the existentialist school. The second question owes its contemporary urgency both to the work of the existentialists and, even more, to that of the linguistic philosophers.

Dr Brown's book deals almost entirely with the existentialists, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Buber and Barth, though Barth retains now far fewer of the marks of an existentialist than he had when he began his *Dogmatik*. Professor Ramsey's book deals almost entirely with the linguistic discussion, and yet the two books most interestingly illuminate each other. Both are important, and Ramsey's as one of the first of a number doubtless in preparation from different hands, may prove to be seminal.

Brown's study has not a clear-cut thesis as Ramsey's has. This is no fault; its unity is of a different kind, a unity given to it by the problem which it studies, as it appears in the works of various thinkers, the problem of objectivity in religion. The book is the work of a powerful and perceptive mind, moving doggedly through digressions which are anything but irrelevant, and continually returning to 'worry' its main theme. The author modestly warns us at the start that he offers no guarantee that his attempt to view the variations of latter-day theology through the perspective pinhole of the subject-object relation will yield edifying results, though he hopes for useful clarifications. And such indeed he gives us on the way. At the end we feel that our journey has not only been necessary but also illuminating, though no final answer has been given, and we realise that, in Dr Brown's own words, the

debate on the main problem of subjectivity and objectivity in religion 'must continue yet awhile'.

At an early stage Dr Brown makes it clear that his use of the terms 'subjective' and 'objective' does not imply any surrender to such an empiricism as would have us judge all knowledge by the standards suited to the natural sciences. 'As regards objectivity all kinds of knowledge are of objects, and truth is adequacy to the nature of the object. "Control by the object" is the touchstone of sanity versus insanity or delusion.' But as we move towards the spheres of art, morality and religion, the contribution of the subject becomes more and more important, and it is this problem as to the relation of the activity of the subject to control by the object in the special sphere of religion and faith which we might say is the central interest of the book.

In Kierkegaard, says Brown, we find a passionate emphasis upon the importance of the subject; did he not say: 'Subjectivity is the truth'? Yet nothing could be further from his intention than to suggest that the truth is what we care to make it. For contrasted with the subject he speaks of the object, the supreme paradox, an act unique in history and to be grasped only by faith—the divine self-revelation in Christ.

In Heidegger the theme is a secular anthropology. Here the emphasis on the subject is even greater. The subject makes itself, and all its activities, including its instinctive practical knowledge and scientific knowledge, are projects, whereby it confers meaning upon its world.

But, asks Brown acutely, does not Heidegger's phenomenological method, which claims to be free from arbitrary presuppositions, amount to an acknowledgment that there is control by the object, that there is a truth in things?

In Buber we find the picture of two approaches to reality, the I-Thou approach and the I-It approach. The I-Thou approach is personal, involving a commitment of the whole self; the I-It approach is theoretic, abstracting and masterful. According to Dr Brown it is, however, uncertain whether for Buber, apart from our relation to human persons as 'Thou', the object (in Brown's sense), really confronts the 'I' in a personal manner, or whether this is a metaphor. It is thus in the end uncertain whether Buber's thought is theistic or pantheistic.

In Barth we have an emphatic emphasis on the objective grace and initiative of the Trinitarian God, which yet does not swallow up the initiative or personality of man. Here we find a deliberate and riotous mixture of philosophical terms, but the general sense of the teaching is clear.

In a suggestive but difficult last chapter Brown tells us that the existential emphasis on the contribution of the subject to the object calls attention to the fact that 'religion and ethics, community life and intellectual and artistic endeavour, are not matters in which truth is found, but in some sort made. . . . As such they cannot be known apart from the subject's entering into them, participating in them, making them part of its substance, making itself in terms of them. The question is whether there is a general "objective" truth in these departments of existence, discoverable upon participation in them. It is a mere prejudice to think that in all spheres objectivity should be defined in terms of complete indifference to the activities of the knowing subject. It is still a question whether the subject's involvement in the objects of its concern may not yield insights that are relevant to the ultimate nature of things.' This last chapter is, perhaps inevitably at this stage in the discussion, indecisive, and it may well be that the way forward will be found through further prolonged and careful examination of various fields in which truth is not so much found as 'in some sort made'.

This somewhat bare account would be incomplete without an acknowledgment of Dr Brown's valuable contributions in criticism of the writers he studies. Though modestly disclaiming a personal acquaintance with Heidegger, he has said most percipient things about him; he has called in question Heidegger's phenomenological neutrality, and hinted that the problem of substance in Heidegger is perhaps not so much banished as hidden under a difficult terminology. He has indicated the faultiness of Buber's logical mapwork. Surely the field will not be cleared of confusion until Buber's I-Thou : I-It scheme is replaced by another: Knowledge of God—Knowledge about God, Knowledge of Persons—Knowledge about Persons, Knowledge of things—Knowledge about things, where the first and second member of each pair, though dimensionally different from each other, are allowed to interpenetrate and enrich each other. Further Dr Brown has shown both the truth and the confusion in the saying, so often and easily repeated, that God is the Subject who never becomes an object. This is true if it means that God is unquestionably Lord, and can never be known against His will; but it is false and foolish if it implies that a person who is known falls automatically under the power of the knower. Surely this proposition rests on a confusion of language. To become an object of knowledge is not to become an object *simpliciter* in the sense of turning into a thing. It was high time that this absurdity was exposed, and we must be grateful to Dr Brown for exposing it.

Professor Ramsey's book is written with such gusto that the reader is tempted to note passages and inflict them on his friends. It

is no small achievement to have written in such a lively manner on so difficult a theme, yet without conveying the impression of frivolity.

The main thesis here is that religious language is not, as some of the linguistic philosophers have maintained, mere nonsense, but that it has its own peculiar logic. In the situations where religious language is appropriate, there is a discernment which evokes a commitment. Yet in other fields there are various parallels to religious discernment. Here in empirical facts something is seen which was not seen before. The situation takes on a depth, often a personal depth, that cannot be described in empirical language. This discernment is itself an ultimate, and expresses itself in pregnant tautologies. If it is not shared by our interlocutor, we must go on by indirect methods to draw his attention, or open his eyes, to it, until at last the light dawns, or the penny drops. Such discernment is accompanied by a commitment, and in characteristically religious situations, both of these are at a maximum.

In his second chapter, which deals with some characteristic descriptions of God, Ramsey develops his theory of 'models and qualifiers'. Let us take an instance—the sentence: 'God is the First Cause'. Here 'Cause' is a model, depicting a familiar situation, attracting our attention to the causal nexus. 'First' is a 'model' indicating that we should move backwards in time, an injunction which we know can be indefinitely prolonged. But at last a sense of mystery is evoked, which no development of the causal story could eradicate. At this point the word 'first' takes over another function, claiming that the word 'God' is logically prior to all such causal stories. This pattern, together with other similar ones, is followed by Ramsey again and again, and is used most interestingly in his last chapter in relation to formulations of doctrine. Here he draws attention to a pregnant remark of Bethune-Baker's relating to the analogical and mutually limiting character of all terms used to describe the deity, such as 'Logos' and 'Son'. These models are themselves consciously inadequate and 'logical qualifiers attached to them are not further descriptions but words qualifying the models so as to do justice to what is disclosed in worship'.

In the third chapter the language of the Bible is examined to see whether it exhibits the logical impropriety shown to be characteristic of terms describing religious situations. Here it is claimed that this is the case though the meaning of the Bible is often such as the simple man can grasp just as well as the learned. Ramsey cites the words of Mark 16.8 where he assumes for the purpose of the argument that Lightfoot was right in judging this to be the original end of the Gospel, and to describe a situation of religious awe. Again Ramsey cites God's self-disclosure in Exodus, 'I am that I am',

which is taken to be an expression of pregnant tautology rather than a statement that God is 'He who is' or 'He who will be what He will be'. A further instance is Christ's disclosure of Himself to the woman at the well, 'I . . . I am . . . speaking to you', in which challenge 'there is so much more than descriptive theology could cover'.

In a similar manner miracle is treated as 'a non-conforming event . . . whose oddness gives rise to . . . a characteristically theological situation. With a miracle a situation "comes alive", the light dawns, the penny drops.'

Ramsey's general thesis is most suggestive, and it will be of interest to see how the linguistic experts set about criticising it from their standpoint. As a contribution to the debate this book is clearly of great importance.

It is in his discussion of particular narratives and in the detail of the work that some will feel Dr Ramsey to be more open to criticism. Nothing could be more admirable than his first two pages on miracle. It is a pity that Dr Bultmann could not have had something of this kind before him when he sat down to write his essay on Miracle in *Glauben und Verstehen*. But if scientific law is something which cannot forbid its infringement, or can be broken and reformulated as often as you like, as Ramsey well says, then surely we do not come to the discernment which evokes our commitment in relation to a miracle, because we see a law being broken and reformulated, broken and reformulated, until the penny drops; but because in some event there is something that startles us, and intuitively we see in it God at work. Here it seems that the attempt to fit the 'model-qualifier' schematism is somewhat artificial.

Dr Ramsey cannot be accused of justifying all the more grotesque Old Testament miracles such as the story of iron swimming, though he gives this as an instance of that appearance of personal activity and power where no human agency is at work, which is a characteristic sign of miracle. For he expressly says that it is no part of his task to enter on the discussion of the evidence for particular miracles.

But surely the Virgin Birth is either an event which was empirical and describable in terms of fact, or it is nothing. To equate it with the mystery of Christ's person is a step that no earlier theologian has taken.

Again Dr Ramsey's interpretation of the Ascension as 'departure-empowering', according to which we can hardly tell whether Christ is going or coming, is more ingenious than convincing. This may have been what the two angels meant, but it is certainly not what St. Luke thought they meant. Whatever the difficulties of the Ascension narrative, they will not be solved thus, by an explana-

tion in which the eschatological 'not-yet' has been simply excised.

Yet once more, Ramsey's account of prophecy as providing its first disclosure at the time that the prophecy was made, while the question of its future verification seems not to matter, is not persuasive. Suppose that someone had stood by when the second Isaiah encouraged the Hebrews with the promise of God's deliverance of them from Babylon by the hand of Cyrus, and had commented, 'You know, not one of these things which he foretells will God do for you!' Would the disclosure not have been cancelled out?

And it appears that Ramsey's view of prophecy would allow him to claim that the birth of Christ did really fulfil the prediction made in Isaiah that a young woman would be with child, though it is quite clear that the original writer claimed that this event must take place in a year or two, and it never was actually fulfilled. Would not the door be thus opened to every attempt to find fulfilments of prophecy, however unintelligent, provided that someone could be found to claim that here was a further disclosure?

Right through his book Ramsey points out how the kind of situation he is describing in our knowledge of persons, and still more in our knowledge of God, is a situation describable in empirical terms, and *more*, the 'more' being that which reveals itself to discernment, and accompanied by commitment. Clearly, in speaking of commitment, he is here wrestling with the same problem as Dr Brown in his dealing with the contribution of the subject, though of course the empirical is by no means to be equated with the objective. The Resurrection is that which faith discerns over and above the accompanying empirical evidence. Ramsey goes on to say that the Empty Tomb was an empirical fact. It can be dated. 'But you can no more date the Resurrection than you can walk out with Pythagoras' Theorem.'

May it not be that even Ramsey has not quite broken clear of the pair of concepts which are employed in William Temple's and Tillich's work on revelation: fact plus interpretation, fact plus revelatory depth, a pair of concepts which is sometimes to be found in C. H. Dodd also. It seems that Dodd gives us in another place the clue which will help us here, though perhaps he does not fully recognise its significance. He says that the kind of paradigm for the particular kind of history with which faith is concerned is: 'The Word became flesh.'

I do not think that we shall do justice to the objectivity of revelation until we leave off speaking in terms of historical event plus significance of meaning. We must, as Ramsey would say, use a more complicated logical mapwork. Significance and meaning are timeless. Is that why Ramsey says that we cannot date the Resurrec-

tion, that he still regards it as a meaning, a significance? But revelation, if it is anything, is in time. It is act, but Divine Act, Divine Event. Revelation has thus a *double* event-character. First, it happens through empirical events, a birth, a healing, and so on. Then faith perceives that this event is also a Divine Event, a Divine Act. And in both cases event and interpretation are a unity. For an event which has no meaning is a pure nothingness.

Obviously in 'Divine Event', 'Event' is a 'model', and 'Divine' is a 'qualifier'. Here 'Event' cannot mean just what it means in the case of empirical events, and so the use is in a sense mythical. When we say: 'The Word became flesh', we discern the Divine Event in the empirical one, but it remains mystery, and we speak in order not to be silent. Here we have that essential residuum of myth which Professor Kümmel has so rightly affirmed to be the life-blood of the Christian faith. But this event is datable, for Christ's Incarnation was datable. And the Resurrection must be datable also, if we interpret it, as surely we must, as meaning: 'He came back to His disciples having triumphed over death.'

As we close these fascinating books, we may feel that neither of them has given us the answer on either of the questions with which we started: the relation of faith to history, and the nature of religious objectivity. But each of them has set us forward on the road towards understanding—and given us how much of illumination on other related questions by the way! DAVID CAIRNS

Faith and Knowledge. By JOHN HICK. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., and Oxford University Press, London, 1957. Pp. xix + 221. Price in U.K., 28s.

THIS book will commend itself at once to readers who have followed the recent attempts of theologians to deal with the criticisms and difficulties raised by linguistic and analytic philosophers against religious epistemology and theological method. In the Introduction the author states the problem to which the book is his projected answer. Given the fact that religious people claim to know God by faith, what precise kind of cognition is this? As the locus of Revelation is 'not language but history, not propositions but events', faith, we are told, on its cognitive side is 'apprehension of God as acting self-revealingly towards us'.

Part I lays the foundation for the whole discussion with an analysis of the distinction which is as old as philosophy itself, between knowledge and belief. He questions the long-established assumption that knowledge is a mode of cognition which is self-authenticating and infallible, as stated in the propositions, 'X knows

p entails that *p* is true; whereas, X believes *p* does not entail anything about the truth-value of *p*.' He criticises this view of knowledge on two grounds. First, it is an *a priori* definition of what knowledge is. Secondly, knowledge as thus defined never occurs; for second-order knowing (i.e., knowing that we know) may be illusory. So Dr Hick proposes to treat the word 'knowledge' as a diploma word, to be applied to the experience of absolute psychological certainty. On the other hand, a belief-situation is defined as one constituted by someone regarding a proposition as true. Since there are at any moment many propositions of which we are not thinking, belief in a proposition may be 'stored' in the form of a disposition to act as if it were true.

In Part II three theistic positions are expounded and criticised with a view to extracting from them part of the structure of the author's own position. The chapter on 'The Voluntarist Theory of Faith', represented by Pascal, Wm. James, James Ward and F. R. Tennant, contains a particularly shrewd analysis of the last-named. Kant and the late Professor D. M. Baillie are taken as examples of thinkers for whom faith is closely associated with moral experience; while the 'illative sense' of Cardinal Newman illustrates the notion of faith as informal inference, yielding knowledge which is not susceptible to the criteria of the traditional formal logic.

In Part III the main task is engaged upon. In the description of 'the nature of faith', the basic theme is that awareness of God takes place in the context of a material and social environment. This mediated character of religious knowledge is a feature of all cognitive experience, even although the subject of religious knowledge is *sui generis*. In elaborating this theme, Dr Hick employs two concepts, 'interpretation' and 'significance'. Consciousness is consciousness of significance, and the significance of a given situation is the practical difference which the situation makes to the agent. The correlative of significance is interpretation. While some interpretations may be logically exclusive, others may be regarded as constituting a kind of hierarchy—the higher being superimposed upon, and penetrating, the lower. In the main, these levels are threefold—the natural, the human and the divine. The higher the level the more explicit and self-conscious the process of interpretation in which the significance of the whole is detected. Concerning 'the logic of faith', and the question of what would have to occur or to have occurred to constitute a disproof of the love or existence of God, the writer makes the rather interesting comment that an appeal to eschatological verification may act as a guarantee of the assertion-status of theism.

According to the account of the Christian Faith in Part IV, certain points in the field of significance are focuses for our processes

of interpretation. To change the figure, they are catalysts which concentrate into definable structure an otherwise amorphous mass. In Christianity, the person of Jesus Christ performs this very function. From faith *in* Christ the believer moves to faith *from* Christ, a process in which he reinterprets the whole area of his experience from this newly acquired standpoint.

The virtues of this work are plainly evident—the courage with which the writer handles arguments and criticisms which have for some time been felt to be cogent *philosophical* objections to religious experience and Christian theology; his original treatment of some very old problems, such as the relation of belief to knowledge; and his integration both of our knowledge of God with that of other selves and the world: and of our life in God with our existence in other spheres.

If difficulty is felt in respect of some parts of the book, then it is raised in the context of such appreciation. First, it must be asked whether the author has done full justice to the extent to which our *historical* knowledge of Jesus Christ enters into our knowledge of God. Thus, he is led into saying on p. 127 that the primary locus of religious significance is the believer's existence as a whole—which in itself is not true for the Christian, and is, in fact, denied by Dr Hick at p. 196, where it is implied rightly that Christ is the primary locus. In other words, it is doubtful whether the last chapter is the correct point at which to introduce the Christian subject-matter in a book on faith. Further, in the final chapter, it seems to be assumed that the nature of historical knowledge is something which can be taken for granted, whereas in fact it involves problems as difficult as any raised in this book.

Secondly, while he would no doubt not desire to do so, he conveys the impression that Revelation consists (*a*) in finding a God who is already there; (*b*) by rearranging material already there. 'The discovery of God arises from interpreting in a new way what was already before us . . . comparable to the discovery of the pattern in a puzzle' (p. 185). This is a faulty doctrine of Revelation, and it is a serious defect in a book on this subject. In short, the theological side of the book is not so convincingly written as the philosophical; and the short Part IV comes as an anticlimax to the rest of the work. The distinction drawn between dogma and doctrine scarcely answers to the history of these terms. To say that the Church's conviction of the Deity of Jesus Christ 'represented the unfolding of a judgment that was already implicit in the practical attitudes, reactions, the feelings, hopes and loyalties of the disciples while they followed Jesus in Palestine' is to fail to see how profound was the change wrought by the Resurrection in the disciples' understanding

of who Christ really was. There is too a strange nineteenth-century Liberal quality about the suggestion that 'the Deity of Christ was mediated first through His moral character'.

Despite these theological deficiencies, it is the courage, the clarity and the originality of the book which remain its final distinction.

There is a misprint on p. 17, l.10; while on p. 186, l.3, the word 'among' should read 'in'. JOHN MCINTYRE

Thinking Towards Religion. By PAUL ROUBICZEK. Darwen Finlayson. 15s.

KARL ADAM, in a phrase that has become famous, spoke of 'the playground of the theologians'. The metaphor is no less apt when applied to the philosophers. Does not the English philosophical scene today bear a certain resemblance to a large playground, with the children split up into their groups, but all playing the same game, some on one side, some opposing them? Nearly all play with deep and engrossed earnestness. Here and there, however, is a non-conformist who is not playing the common game but observing with a certain detachment and thinking. Mr Roubiczek is one of these. His philosophy, far from being a pastime, is ready to stake its existence on its conclusions. In this connexion, a sentence in the first chapter reminded me of his book on John Hus: 'The external compulsions may be extremely strong, but nobody can force us to act against our convictions if we are prepared to run the risk of sacrificing our lives' (pp. 23-24). Because he is this kind of non-conformist, Mr Roubiczek has the greater importance in English philosophy.

It is plain that for the last hundred years or so theology has been encountering, not a more intelligent, but certainly a better informed and more sophisticated and self-conscious scepticism than before in European thought. This scepticism is most clearly seen and is most intense in the conflict between science and religion. The great battle between these two in the nineteenth century was left unresolved, partly perhaps because both sides drew conclusions they were unqualified to draw and partly because the real differences were, in fact, insoluble. The real conflict is not between science and religion in themselves and as such, but between the scientific attitude as applied to religion and the religious attitude. This Mr Roubiczek calls an opposition between knowledge and faith. But we must notice that he is not using knowledge in its traditional theological sense of knowledge of God or knowledge of the saving history; this he calls belief and includes within faith. For him, knowledge is that which is acquired experientially and it is this quality which de-

cisively distinguishes it from faith, which is not acquired but given and received. Knowledge may be divided into external and internal modes. The external is the scientific mode—though this should not be confined to science as a discipline and study, but is rather an attitude of mind which is necessary in science and therefore rules there, but can be, and is, applied outside science. In this mode of thinking, man has facts at his disposal and can become their master and proceed from cause to effect or from effect back to cause. Although the earlier search for a single, all-explaining system or principle has been abandoned, scientific thinking itself has not fundamentally changed, nor indeed can change. It is ruled by determinism and the cause-effect relationship.

Now, Mr Roubiczek insists that 'external' knowledge validly corresponds to reality, but only to 'external' reality. But he shows that it is not the all-inclusive mode of knowledge that it is all too often made out to be. For there is also the 'inward' knowledge, corresponding to 'inward' reality, the sphere where determinism and the cause-effect relationship has no validity, the sphere of values, of truth and beauty in their various contingencies and not least in personal relationships. We should not imagine that this is equivalent to faith. It is still 'knowledge', acquired and not given. Faith itself lies on the other side of the boundary.[1] Hence, we are not here presented with a glib apologetics which plays off one part of man's experience against another and then equates it with religious experience and that with faith. For Mr Roubiczek's philosophy is true and wise when it recognises that it has its limitations and must halt at the boundary where faith begins and by so doing will delineate that boundary: 'I believe that the true object of philosophy is the search for ultimate truth, not because I assume that we can succeed in this search, but because it will bring us to the boundaries which we have to accept and thus make them clear to us' (p. 29).

This book is an attempt to let philosophy serve within its limitations. In the first place, by opposing the two modes of knowledge as valid within their own spheres and only within their own spheres he destroys the exclusiveness of scientific thinking[2] and thus creates the possibility not only of a second mode but also of that which lies beyond both, faith. And also, although 'inward' knowledge is not faith, it yet possesses certain of the same qualities as faith and therefore points towards it. Hence, philosophy has primarily the critical task of attacking any claim to absoluteness made on this

[1] In Roubiczek we find certain concepts 'belonging' to other thinkers. E.g. 'boundary' seems to refer us at once to Tillich or the *Römerbrief*, and the givenness of faith to Barth. In fact, I think that these and similar ideas have a peculiar meaning and that primarily Roubiczek should be interpreted in his own light.

[2] And, we may add, the cultural snobbishness of the arts faculties!

side of the boundary: 'His main task is, in fact, to prove that a knowledge which is both comprehensive and absolute is impossible, and he is therefore obliged to leave this greater achievement to a faith which remains outside philosophy' (p. 188).

Such a genuine humility may not find favour in the playground, where the play's the thing; but it is likely to prove fruitful if accepted as the attitude of philosophy. A final question: Has Mr Roubiczek applied his concept of philosophy as strictly as he could have done? I think not. There are some inconsistencies in his treatment of knowledge and faith which would have disappeared if the boundary had been borne in mind more often. It is very much to be hoped that this is no more than Mr Roubiczek's preliminary word and that he will pursue the course which he has mapped out. If he does so, and with the profound insights into philosophy and theology that he reveals here, the result cannot fail to be of great moment to philosophy.

T. H. L. Parker

The State in the New Testament. By O. Cullmann. S.C.M., London, 1957. Pp. 121. 12s. 6d.

The relation between Church and State is a perennial problem, but it exists already in the New Testament because it is a corollary of the eschatological tension within Christianity. The Church is the community of the coming age, but it lives in the *present* age. This paradoxical situation begins with Jesus Himself, not only in His teaching but supremely and centrally in His death at the hands of Rome as 'King of the Jews', as a political rebel—the greatest misunderstanding in history. Professor Cullmann rightly emphasises the nationalist Zealot movement as a vital factor of His time with which He had to reckon, and whose aims and methods He completely rejected. Yet He was personally involved in having in His circle former Zealots. This is not certain, despite Cullmann's assertion to the contrary, even as regards Simon the Zealot, who possibly merely had the nickname 'zealous'. Less satisfactory is the revival of the derivation of Iscariot from *sicarius*, the adoption of Eisler's derivation of St. Peter's surname Bar Jona from an Accadian word meaning 'terrorist', and the view that the nickname 'sons of thunder' given to James and John indicates that they too had been Zealots.

The chapter on the condemnation of Jesus includes a valuable contribution to the debate on the problem of His trial. 'Even if the Jews were obliged to have their death-sentences ratified by the Romans, it is none the less possible that in the case of Jesus no death sentence was passed by the Jews, but rather that His judicial con-

demnation was by the Romans. To this extent I acknowledge the justice of Lietzmann's position' (that it was the Romans who condemned Jesus) (p. 42). Cullmann rejects, however, Lietzmann's view that the examination before the Jews in the synoptic Gospels is completely unhistorical, while he thinks that the question whether or not the Jews in the procuratorial period were competent to carry out a capital sentence, to which Lietzmann tried to give an affirmative answer, is really a side-issue and probably insoluble. In any case the question whether it was the Romans or the Jews who condemned Jesus does not depend on it. The Fourth Gospel is regarded as more reliable here than the Synoptics. That the hearing took place before the former high priest Annas and not before Caiaphas, who held office at the time, strengthens the case for the unofficial character of the interrogation, the object of which was to satisfy Pilate, in view of the popularity of Jesus with the people, that the Jewish authorities really desired His death. Jesus, like Barabbas, was condemned by the Romans as a Zealot.

In the following two chapters the apparently conflicting attitudes to the Roman Empire adopted in very different political circumstances by St. Paul and the writer of the Johannine Apocalypse are examined, and the conclusion is reached that both are in the direct line of succession to the teaching of Jesus, namely, that the state has certain legitimate claims within its own sphere and is only to be resisted (but never by force) when it dares to claim what belongs to God alone.

The book, slight in compass but worthy of careful attention, concludes with an excursus in defence of the identification of the 'powers' in Rom. 13.1 with demonic forces as well as with the state itself.

A. J. B. Higgins

Dynamics of Faith. By Paul Tillich. George Allen & Unwin. 9s. 6d.

Tillich has tried, in his new book, to rescue the word 'faith' from the morass of 'confusing and distorting connotations, some of which are the heritage of centuries' (p. vii) by reinterpreting it from the start, without presupposing any of them. He enunciates his thesis at the outset in the definition: 'faith is the state of being ultimately concerned' (p. 1). In the rest of this short book he fills up the outline of this formal definition. Faith is distinguished from other human concerns in claiming ultimacy, that is to say, in demanding total surrender of him who accepts this claim, and in promising total fulfilment. Its content, vital though it is to the believer, is irrelevant to its definition as the state of being ultimately concerned. The unconditional character of its concern can find satisfaction only in

an unconditional object. Ultimate concern with something falling short of ultimacy, Tillich argues, breaks down at some point: sooner or later the subject recognises the inadequacy of his object to his concern and emerges radically disappointed. Faith, being the centred act of a whole personality, is disruptive if placed at a point which is not in fact central but peripheral. Such faith Tillich calls 'idolatrous'; faith is true only when the symbol in which it finds expression expresses the ultimate which really is ultimate.

As this very brief summary indicates, Tillich begins with a definition, which he goes on to elaborate. His analysis makes no claim to describe anybody's faith in particular, and is presumably meant to be applicable wherever someone can, in any serious sense, be said to have faith in something. His inquiry is a kind of general, phenomenological one, rather after the manner of Rudolf Otto's inquiry into the holy. (*The Idea of the Holy* is, indeed, the only book on which he draws to any important extent.) Unlike the subject of Otto's great work, however, the notion of faith does not easily lend itself to such a procedure. Significantly, there is no claim anywhere in Tillich's book to support either his definition or its elaboration with evidence taken from one or other or several 'faiths'. Do Christians mean this by 'faith'? Does the Bible really mean this by 'idolatry'? Questions such as these are never asked—either about Christians, Jews, Hindus or anybody else. A Christian reader, in particular, cannot help feeling that the distinctive features of a biblical faith are, of necessity, excluded by such a procedure. Biblical faith is always human response to prior divine action; implying, in the Old Testament, an awaiting in hope the fulfilment of the promise, and in the New, the belief in its accomplishment (cf. Bultmann in *TWzNT*, s.v. πίστις, IV. pp. 182, 209). Idolatrous faith, in the biblical perspective, is precisely the faith created by human concern (cf. Barth, *KD*, IV/1, p. 833).

Tillich cannot admit the priority in faith of anything external to this concern. The biblical stories, from Genesis to the Resurrection, are not the source and foundation of faith, but the symbols in which faith expresses the ultimate. Faith which mistakes its symbols, including the 'symbols' of divine action such as the Incarnation and the Resurrection, for the 'ultimate' by taking them literally, is idolatrous. This judgment would, presumably, extend to the Pauline faith expressed in 1 Cor. 15.17. Such a description of faith is relevant to a biblical faith only in the trivial sense that the Christian believer is in fact ultimately concerned about what he believes to be the saving events which he acknowledges, knows and confesses in his faith. The acknowledgment, knowledge and confession (*Anerkennen, Erkennen, Bekennen*) in which Barth sees the essence of faith, remain,

for Tillich, on the periphery as secondary manifestations of concern. But even though Tillich's account is forced to leave out what, for most theologians, would constitute the essence of faith, it remains to be added that in the course of his description of its dynamics they will often recognise a penetrating insight into the human experience of faith.

R. A. Markus

Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology. By G. B. Caird. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1956. 15s.

Recent work in Biblical Theology has brought with it a notable quickening of interest in the spiritual underworld of New Testament thought. Evidence can be seen in the theology of Paul Tillich and in such a popular work as Gustaf Aulén's *Christus Victor*. In the volume before us, Principal G. B. Caird of Montreal, who has recently given us a fine study of the Apostolic Age, publishes a series of Chancellor's Lectures for 1954 in which the apocalyptic background of St. Paul's theology is submitted to a fresh scrutiny and assessment. Let it be said at once that in point of constructive grasp and insight the book is one of capital interest and important out of all proportion to its modest dimensions.

For Prof. Caird 'the idea of sinister world powers and their subjugation by Christ is built into the very fabric of Paul's thought', and is not to be dismissed as a mere overlag from an obsolete world-view. While the apostle uses mythological language, the language has a rational content. It refers to spiritual realities that belong to the experience of himself and his fellow-Christians. This theme is developed by considering in turn the various orders of life under which by divine appointment man has his existence in the present world. These orders the apostle conceived to have been corrupted and diverted from their proper function by demonic agencies of sin that have drawn power and worship away from God to themselves. He instances successively the pagan state under its divinised 'rulers', the domination of life by legal religion ordained by 'angels' but perverted by Satan to become subservient to his own purposes, and the 'futility' and frustration inseparable from a physical universe which through the irrational element in it has ceased to be subject to God. From these powers and their tyranny St. Paul sees release effected only by the victory of Christ on the Cross, through which alone he looks for the world to be retrieved to God.

Prof. Caird develops his subject under the four heads: 'the Rulers of this age', 'the Great Accuser', 'the Bondage of Corruption', and 'What the Rulers did not Know'. The idea of World Rulers of the present age is traced back to Israel's primitive belief in pagan gods

existing in some sort of relation to Yahweh. They are first regarded as subordinate powers acting under the authority of Yahweh and forming part indeed of His 'council'. The Deuteronomist brings order and equilibrium into the system by representing these subordinate spirits as angelic rulers to whom the pagan nations have been allotted (Deut. 32.8-9, LXX). Later, however, the deep taint of evil attaching to the earthly kingdoms comes to involve the angelic rulers in its shadow. By drawing to themselves the worship of men these 'angels', 'authorities', 'elements', and 'powers' have become alienated from God. Hence the sinister associations of angels and of the pagan state in St. Paul's teaching. Similar is the development of the concept of Satan. Here we find a marked transition from the early idea of Satan as one of the angelic sons of Elohim and member of the heavenly court to the later thought of him as the great adversary of God and man. Dr Caird finds a link between this development and St. Paul's teaching in the thought that Satan, originally the zealot for divine justice, has become identified with the power and terror of the Law, and so appears as the enemy of Christ and the Gospel. 'His tragedy consists precisely in this, that law is not the ultimate truth about God, so that, in defending the honour of God's law, Satan becomes the enemy of God's true purpose.' In what is perhaps the most paradoxical part of his representation Dr Caird sees the law as in actual fact duplicating the functions, elsewhere assigned to Satan, of accuser, condemner, and at the same time tempter of men; apart from Christ, men are in his grip. 'But when Christ's redeeming work is done, when, in the words of Paul, "there is now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus", then Satan can be relieved of his legal responsibilities.' But Satan does not abdicate because, apart from Christ, the law still holds sway.

Under the head 'the Bondage of Corruption', the start is made from the recognition that in the physical order of the world 'there were always some recalcitrant elements which refused to be brought within the scope of the divine sovereignty'. Later apocalyptic Judaism saw a great expansion of this irrational or demonic factor in the cosmos. Prof. Caird brings in Jesus' conflict with the demons for the souls of men and cites St. Paul's passionate words about the bondage and 'futility' of creation in Rom. 8. It is not necessary to illustrate further the scope and contents of this very suggestive book. In the end, the thought into which everything runs up is that the world, over which demonic powers have usurped control, cannot be saved except by that power of love which by the grace of God has intervened in the world in Christ and His Cross. 'To expect that evil will be defeated by any of the powers, by the action of state, by

the self-discipline of the conscience, or by the processes of nature, is to ask that Satan cast out Satan.' WILLIAM MANSON

Religious Liberty. By GIOVANNI MIEGGE. No. 16 of the World Christian Books published by the United Society for Christian Literature. Lutterworth Press, London, 1957. Pp. 95. 2s. 6d.

READERS of this eminent Waldensian professor's earlier book, *The Virgin Mary—the Roman Catholic Marian Doctrine* (English translation published by the Lutterworth Press in 1955), will find in this more slender volume the same attractive qualities—Latin lucidity, a civilised use of historical knowledge, a fair statement of the views of the other camp and a deep Christian compassion.

He divides his essay into two parts. The first is on 'Ideas' and in it he treats of the beginnings and the basic character of religious freedom. This part closes with a succinct statement of 'The Christian Understanding of Liberty'.

He entitles the second section 'The Facts'. In it he follows his theme through 'Christian Countries', 'The Communist World' and the 'Non-Christian World'. (His nomenclature here is weak; it smacks of the 1910 Edinburgh Conference.) He does what he can, within the narrow limits prescribed for him, to offer judgments on the Church of Rome, the Orthodox Churches, the question of State Churches, the problem of the Church—State—Education triangle, the new Church Law in Sweden, the way of America, the way of France, the Swiss constitutional ban on the Jesuits, the 'People's Democracies', etc. In this way great generalisations are unavoidable, but he picks his way very well.

This little book, like the others in the series, will be used for translations among the younger Churches. I wonder what the indigenous pastors and elders will make of it. In some parts of Africa they will doubtless be surprised at all the fuss. In other areas they will feel that he has not been sufficiently radical. Everywhere they would do well to ponder the reflections of this member of a community which has come through the fires of persecution. Their times of testing lie ahead. KENNETH MACKENZIE

The Messiah in the Old Testament. By HELMER RINGGREN. (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 18.) S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

IT is good to have the original (1954) *Messias konungen* in an English form. The book gives a balanced and restrained account of recent studies, mostly Scandinavian, whereby modern theories of a 'divine king' in Old Israel are being used to rehabilitate something of the

traditional Christian interpretation of messianic psalms and prophecies. Sacral kingship in Israel is regarded as 'a shadow of things to come'. From the so-called Royal Psalms (2, 110, 72, 21, 45) the author builds up the picture of the Divine King in Israel, the Anointed of Yahweh, His 'son' who shall rule over the whole earth for ever and ever. Dr Ringgren finds the same motifs in the messianic prophecies of Isaiah 7, 9, 11, etc. He then turns to the Servant Songs of Second-Isaiah, and here he finds ideas of the future splendour of the sacral king interwoven with motifs of humiliation and suffering which originate in the Tammuz rites. To these he adds Engnell's 'servant psalms' (18, 22, 49, etc.), psalms which have been interpreted traditionally as predictions of the Passion of Christ. All this is interwoven into the pattern of the New Year Feast of old Israel, Mowinckel's 'Coronation Feast', Weiser's 'Covenant Feast', supposed to have been observed in pre-exilic Israel, and to have embodied a cult drama, humiliation of the sacral king, sacred marriage, promises of future prosperity and blessedness and the rest.

For those who accept these theories of a Coronation Feast of Yahweh in Israel, this monograph will be both interesting and convincing. To those who, like the reviewer, are still unconvinced, the monograph is interesting, informative, and in part convincing. There is still too much 'probably' and 'must have been' in the descriptions of this Feast. The author recognises this frankly, and it is in this frank admission that the welcome balance and restraint is to be found. The book is convincing in the way in which it shows how the two interwoven motifs lead to the idea of a Suffering Messiah to whom the Jews were blind. The Tammuz connexion seems as slender as ever. But, in all fairness, this has to be said: the assumption of a ritual humiliation of the sacral king provides a reasonable way in which the two contrary themes could have been interwoven. And yet this interweaving is already to be found in Isa. 53, without any need for assuming a Coronation Feast, or indeed even a sacral king. NORMAN H. SNAITH

Jésus et les païens. By J. JEREMIAS. Cahiers Théologiques 39. Delachaux et Niestlé. Neuchatel and Paris, 1956. 4.70 fr.

THIS book has a value far beyond its size; indeed it contains more substance than many books five times its length. A French translation of *Jesu Verheissung für die Völker*, it is marked throughout by the meticulous scholarship characteristic of Dr Jeremias—not every scholar can add a reference to Strack-Billerbeck! (p. 42, n. 1). Unfortunately a number of misprints have been overlooked by the translator.

Professor Jeremias begins with the question of the attitude of Jesus towards the evangelisation of the Gentiles, and states three negative propositions. To these he adds, in apparent contradiction, three others summing up what Jesus said about the Gentiles. Then in his third chapter he propounds his solution: that Jesus expected and announced the incorporation of the Gentiles in the Kingdom of God *as the last great revelation of the grace of God* (p. 63). A brief conclusion expounds the relevance of the Christian mission of today in this context. The whole is a revelation of careful and accurate critical scholarship, in the highest sense of the term.

Not every reader, of course, will follow Dr Jeremias all the way, but even those who differ will find here food for thought. Matt. 8.7, for example, appears in a new light read as a question (and if it is not, why the emphatic pronoun?) (p. 25). Again, we may feel that some passages in Matthew which suggest a mission of the apostles among the nations are dismissed too lightly (p. 19), only to be reminded on the next page that the early Jewish-Christian community did not immediately take up a Gentile mission; the initiative here was taken by the Hellenists. Altogether a stimulating venture into truly biblical theology. R. McL. Wilson

A Letter of Wise Counsel: Studies in the First Epistle of Peter. By Edward A. Maycock. No. 15 of the World Christian Books published by the United Society for Christian Literature (Lutterworth Press), London, 1957. Pp. 96. 2s. 6d.

The Rev. E. A. Maycock served for fifteen years in Nyasaland with the Universities Mission to Central Africa. For most of that time he taught African theological students on Likoma Island in Lake Nyasa. He is now training English theological students at Chichester. He records this interesting conviction: '. . . when I was giving lectures to African ordinands and catechists about 1 Peter, I remember feeling—and they felt too—how very relevant almost every word in the letter was to their situation. Now in England, I do not find the situation so very different; the temptations and difficulties of Christians in England are similar in many ways to those of African Christians. The teaching of 1 Peter is as relevant and necessary here as it is in Africa.' As one who has also worked in Nyasaland, the reviewer strongly endorses this.

Mr Maycock's concern is pre-eminently practical. He does not deviate from the questions (i) What was the message of this letter to the first people who read it? and (ii) What is its message to us today?

He has a simple and clear introduction in which he deals with

how to read a book of the Bible, the general theme of 1 Peter, the Kerygma and the Didache and the real authority of 1 Peter. He then outlines the theology of the epistle. The substance of his book is on the Text (English of course) and Commentary. Here is no Biblical Theology hanging in the air. Yet this is no morality broken loose from its moorings. This material is admirable for the missionary or indigenous pastor who is facing a course for catechists, evangelists or lay folks. I am also not sure but that many a minister serving the more literate population of this country will find this book a godsend for his Bible Class or Catechumens' Class.

Mr Maycock has a bibliography of sensible proportions. He tackles the more academic and controversial issues of authorship, provenance and date only in his epilogue.

He has already written one or two small books in Chi-Nyanja; this is his first in English. Let us hope that it will not be his last.

KENNETH MACKENZIE

Botschaft des Neuen Testamentes; II. Band: Die Entfaltung der Botschaft; Halbband 2: Der Inhalt der Botschaft. By M. ALBERTZ. Evangelischer Verlag AG Zollikon-Zürich, 1957. DM. 25.85.

WHOEVER has this Book need never lack for sermons. Not that the sermons are here provided in tabloid form, requiring only to be lifted out and preached—the preacher has work to do in hewing out the stones and shaping them to his need. But here is an inexhaustible quarry, offering the material for preaching which will be both doctrinal and above all biblical, presented under various major and minor headings. What, for example, is the message of the New Testament concerning God's will for Israel, for mankind, for the world? Or about the Holy Spirit, the Church and its members, Baptism or the Lord's Supper? The themes have often been discussed, sometimes with more concern for critical analysis than for the message itself; here the message is set out with detailed biblical references at every turn. It is not an easy book to read, but he who gets to grips with it will find on every page a stimulus to reflection.

This *Halbband* is the last of four from the pen of the late Professor of Theology in Berlin, whose death was reported shortly before the book was published. The first volume dealt with the Origin of the Message (I.1 (1947) *Die Entstehung des Evangeliums*; I.2 (1952) *Die Entstehung des apostolischen Schriftenkanons*), while the second is concerned with its unfolding. II.1 (1954), after dealing with the presuppositions, began the study of the Content of the Message, which is now completed in II.2. Taking as his text the Benediction of 2 Cor. 13.13, Albertz treats successively of 'the grace of our Lord

Jesus Christ' (II.1) and now of 'the love of God' and 'the communion of the Holy Spirit'. A final section is devoted to the beginnings of Christian theology. This latest volume also contains a forty-page index of biblical passages, covering the whole work, and shorter lists of names and subjects.

One notable feature of the book is the absence of the conventional scholarly apparatus, which Albertz explains in the preface partly by the conditions under which the first volume was compiled (May 1945—his own library destroyed and the public libraries in Berlin in a state of siege), and partly by a criticism of the convention itself. None can achieve completeness, nor is it possible to provide a comprehensive discussion of the views of other scholars—why then the bibliographies and footnotes? Nor can anyone really claim to be completely abreast of the present state of research—the apparatus in the long run rests upon an arbitrary selection of the literature, which the author happens to have read. Why not then provide only references to the original sources? With much of what Albertz says one must cordially agree, and certainly he is right against those for whom 'research' appears to consist in the compiling of endless lists of books and articles on one side and on the other; some day machines will do that for us. It may, however, be suggested that there is perhaps still room for the convention, properly applied: (*a*) to indicate the source of a statement, whether original or secondary, (*b*) to guide the reader in his further study by reference to relevant literature and especially to detailed studies of which the results are being assumed, and (*c*) where there is conflict of opinion to indicate the fact by adducing one or two representatives of the other side. Enough should be given for the reader to follow up the question for himself, but a concordance of all the literature on the subject should not be expected of any author.

Part of the blame must certainly be borne by reviewers. It is one thing to offer a friendly suggestion, to draw an author's attention to something which, being human, he may have overlooked; but it is a bad review that fastens on the shortcomings of a writer, the more especially when it is a case of overlooking an article (often the reviewer's own) in a periodical which may not be readily accessible. Neglect of standard works is of course another matter. As it is, the form of the present work is such as to make an apparatus somewhat superfluous, although it bears throughout clear marks of thorough and careful scholarship. And although Albertz provides no bibliography in the usual sense, he does supply all that is required in an appendix designed for the student, which gives a very comprehensive survey of the German literature (even to an elementary Greek Grammar).

His primary concern in this volume is, however, not with criticism but with the message of the New Testament itself. The book is in a way an introduction to the New Testament, but it is also more. Nor is it a conventional Theology of the New Testament. It is the message that is the dominant theme. A significant note is struck at the outset in the dedication, which brings together the names of John A. Mackay, Josef Hromadka and D. T. Niles. 'Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments ist oekumenisch'; but there is a real danger that this Book which came out of the East may be misunderstood and the Gospel equated with or contaminated by our merely Western culture. If here and there the book may be open to criticism, for example as incurring the dangers of the old 'proof-text' method, it remains to the author's lasting credit that he has really tried to grapple with the message of the New Testament. The book may be 'unorthodox' in some ways; but it may also herald the beginning of a new era in which the message of the New Testament will be restored to its rightful place.

R. McL. Wilson

When Christ Comes and Comes Again. By T. F. Torrance. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

A volume of sermons by a Professor of Christian Dogmatics must always be turned to with exceptional expectation. For it is his special function to study and expound to future preachers the whole range and content of the system of Christian Doctrine. In such a book we ought to look primarily for the very substance of the truth which the Church is commissioned to proclaim to men, quite apart from the form and the method of the proclaiming. It is accordingly on this 'theological content of evangelism' that Professor Torrance concentrates in an enriching and searching book.

The present reviewer recalls that the very first essay which he was required to write by Professor Torrance's predecessor, Professor H. R. Mackintosh, was the theme of the relation of Dogmatics and Preaching. Professor Mackintosh often expressed the view that a doctrine which cannot be preached is for that reason a defective or false doctrine. It is clear that Professor Torrance is in full agreement with this, for he never loses sight of the contemporary situation. This is the work of a most learned theologian, an evangelical preacher and a keen Churchman—a fine but rare combination of qualities. In his recent book, *The Burning Bush*, Professor G. D. Henderson speaks of a seventeenth-century Scottish theologian who drifted towards a vague mysticism because he found 'theological speculation unprofitable, theological systems unnourishing, and theological controversy uncharitable'. This book lifts us out of all

that into another world of stable truth and dynamic urgency.

The sixteen sermons of the book are grouped in four sections—the Advent of the Redeemer, the Word of the Gospel, the Foundation of the Church, and the Faithfulness of God. All of which, obviously enough, belongs to the very centralities. The Scripture passages on which the sermons are based are printed in full, which is itself symbolic of Professor Torrance's emphasis 'to bring the preaching of the Church to the bar of the Word of God'. In every case the exposition is good and fresh. He sees 'aspects of modern preaching which give rise to anxiety', 'a failure to hold together in unity' great truths which are too often presented in isolation from each other, and a 'frequent tendency for the Word of God to be bound in the fetters and techniques of an "evangelical tradition" which is man-made and does not derive from the Gospel itself, and can only succeed in making important elements of the Word of none effect.'

The very title of the book announces a theme that is never lost sight of all through its pages, and is certainly not confined to the first chapter; but at the heart of everything is our response to the First Coming of Christ. The Second Advent is set in its true perspective, and both the First and Second Advent are taken with complete seriousness. How other could it truly be? It is characteristic of Professor Torrance's theology that he insists on the humanity of Jesus too, and its place in our Salvation —'This same Jesus will come again, and come wearing our humanity.' Still it is a Majestic Christ who knocks at the Church's door, whose voice is as a sharp, two-edged sword. The Virgin Birth is accepted as pure miracle—'God sets the miracle of the Virgin Birth at the very beginning of the Gospel to show us the way that God's Love takes with us in all our human frailty and weakness.'

There is much suggestive material on what Christ did for us as Lamb of God, on conversion, on having Christ as Personal Saviour, Christ for us, in us, and with us. The exposition of the burning bush, and its linking with the washing of the disciples' feet, gets at the essential conditions of man's approach to God. On the sacraments, his teaching is high in the sense that it is very deep—and that is the only sort of high doctrine that really matters. Some readers will not find agreeable what is said on Infant Baptism.

All in all, the Tell-Scotland Movement to which this book is dedicated in admiration and encouragement should be powerfully reinforced, if it is able to succeed in getting many people up and down the land to grasp fully what it is that has to be told and what is the only source from which to draw it. Perhaps the book would have been even more serviceable if it had not been 'shorn of illus-

trative and literary material' to the extent that is acknowledged in the Preface. There are two moving and vital illustrations, direct from life, on pages 54 and 112. Probably it ought not to be held against one of the ablest living expositors of Calvin that, like Calvin, he is somewhat sparing of the simpler illustrative material. He is also in the good company of Thomas Chalmers in not making his sermons a string of quotations.

There is room for considerable concern when a minister's library is found to have a large number of volumes of sermons. The defect of many such books which attain popularity is that it is difficult to make use of them at all, except it be a wholesale use. But, when a book of sermons has, as this one has in abundance, sentences which kindle the thought and send the mind questing on its own searches and discoveries, that kind of book cannot be too often in our hands. Here are some of these rich sentences—'There is no getting away from the fact that intellectually the Gospel of Jesus Christ is utterly bewildering'; 'There is no back-stair into the Kingdom of God'; 'We want all the material benefits of the Christian faith, without the Mighty Word of God at the heart of it, from which all these other benefits flow'; 'Because there was nothing special about His appearance, the Gospels tell us nothing about it'; 'The more like a Lamb He is, the more like ravening wolves they become'; 'He never barges in upon a man's soul'; 'Baptism does not need to be repeated any more than Calvary needs to be repeated, and indeed to repeat Baptism is to put Christ to an open shame'; 'The Sacraments are sacraments not of our faithfulness, but of God's faithfulness in Christ Jesus'.

GEORGE S. GUNN

Many Things in Parables. Expository Studies. By RONALD S. WALLACE, M.A., B.Sc. Oliver and Boyd, 1955. 15s.

WE already owe to Mr Wallace a very excellent book on *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacraments* which by its qualities of original force and insight, as well as thorough workmanship, has taken a high place in the literature of the subject. He has in preparation also a study of Calvin's doctrine of the Christian Life, which will be awaited with interest and expectation. The present set of studies of our Lord's parables is not a work of research but a specimen of patient and devoted expository preaching. It is an extract from a pulpit ministry published in the hope of its being of service to ministers and teachers as focusing and reflecting in a simple way some of the vital insights into the meaning of the Gospel which have come as the result of the modern deepening of theological studies. Mr Wallace mentions Karl Heim and Emil Brunner as among the

teachers who have stimulated him in the direction of his thought.

The expositions are grouped under the general headings of the Mystery of the Kingdom, the Offer and Cost of Citizenship, the Marks of the True Citizen, the Tragedy of Those Without, and Warnings to All, and there is an appended chapter on the Parable and the Preacher which is reprinted from the *Scottish Journal of Theology*. A marked quality of the book is the simple and objective character of the thinking, the patient concentration on the words of Jesus, the tenacious insistence with which, having fastened on a theme like 'The Seed is the Word', the writer pursues it through all its veins of meaning. The thought has a pithiness which is not deflected by images or analogies suggesting themselves beyond the bounds of the text. Mr Wallace feels the marvel of so frail an instrument as the Word proving of use against huge and hardened forces of evil. He compares its hidden growth to the work of underground movements making their way under the surface of history. He speaks of Jesus Christ as fighting not against fate or man or social conditions or wrong ideas but against the devil in life and society. The chapter on the Tares and the Wheat is, in this connexion, a good example of toughly realistic exposition: 'Evil works now only in reaction to the Kingdom of God.' Speaking of the Hidden Treasure, the writer remarks: 'Let us not imagine that in our life's experience apart from Christ we have exhausted the limits of what God can do for us.' *A propos* of the Labourers in the Vineyard, he observes: 'It is in free competition with other interests that Christ comes to seek our labour.' The book abounds in similar observations, and should prove a very real incentive and stimulus to preachers.

W. Manson

The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform. By A. Allan McArthur. S.C.M. Press. Pp. 159. 25s.

This notable book seems designed to commend to the attention of the Church of Scotland the scheme of lessons compiled by the author for use in the parish church of which he is minister. Its argument depends to some extent on the conclusions reached in a previous work of great learning, *The Evolution of the Christian Year*; though the present book is complete in itself and will be found to sustain its own argument.

The author's conviction, no doubt a sound one, is that the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacrament are two parts of a combined action, which (in the intention of Calvin and, it appears, of the Scots Reformers) ought never to have been divided. His further conviction that, for the avoidance of disorderly

subjectivism on the part of the individual minister, there should be some sort of consecutive order in the preaching of the word, has led him to compile a lectionary based on the order of the Christian year, consisting of Old Testament, Epistle, and Gospel, for use at the preaching which accompanies the weekly sacrament. But it is the Christian year with a difference—or, if you will, the Christian year reformed. The medieval Latin order, taken up with slight variations in the Book of Common Prayer, from which it has again in part been adopted in recent revisions of the Book of Common Order, is admittedly (from one point of view) an incomplete development of a process begun in Jerusalem in the fourth century. That scheme, arranged round the three points of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, covers no more than half the year and is concerned only with part (albeit the greater part) of the second paragraph of the Creed, and with one single sentence of the third paragraph; it hardly touches the doctrine of creation or the unfolding of prophecy, nor does it deal systematically with events between the Nativity and the Passion, with the continuance in the Church of 'the things which Jesus began to do and to teach', or with the concluding articles of the Christian Creed. These gaps Dr McArthur suggests can be filled up in the more or less blank periods of the Sundays after Epiphany (which he retains on the previous Sunday as a memorial of our Lord's Baptism) and the Sundays after Pentecost. He thinks it may be possible to recover the observance of Christmas and Good Friday, and perhaps of St. Andrew's Day; but for the most part he provides for Sunday worship only, and in particular for Sunday morning. In his second section (pages 35 to 64) by an examination of eight ancient sacramentaries (interesting in itself, but perhaps unnecessarily laboured for the present purpose) he shows that there is nothing essential, or even particularly ancient, in a year which begins with Advent, or in an Advent of only four Sundays: also he will have nothing to do with Ash Wednesday or with the anticipation of Lent in the three preceding Sundays. Thus he draws up a lectionary which begins on the first Sunday in October with a festival of Creation (Harvest Festival) and continues with five Sundays after Creation, concerned with the doctrine of creation, the fall, the divine judgment and mercy. Six Sundays in Advent deal with the Covenant, and with the prophecies of the Messiah, and so lead to Christmas. Nine possible Sundays after Epiphany and six in Lent cover in prophecy, epistle, and gospel the earthly life of our Lord and the preparation for the Passion. Lessons are provided for every day in Holy Week, except Saturday: and here your reviewer would put it on record that as much as fifty years ago James Cooper (of revered memory) said to him, 'I have

preached every day in Holy Week for forty years.' From Easter to Pentecost the lessons proposed cover the final sentences of the second paragraph of the Nicene Creed, with the Paschal Discourses for their main framework: and twenty conceivable Sundays after Pentecost, with lessons largely from the Acts, but (as always) with appropriate Old Testament attachments, provide for the rest of Christian teaching.

Such, in outline, is the lectionary which, the author says, 'will make manifest the Biblical Revelation of the Triune God'. The third part of the book (pages 65 to 88) explains its structure.

It would be an impertinence for a stranger, not of that particular family of the House of Israel, to attempt to judge how far this scheme can be, or ought to be, acceptable to the Church of Scotland. Possibly any attempt to impose it by authority would be met by passive resistance. Yet it may be said that this or some similar programme might be of great advantage in rescuing preaching from the whimsies and favouritisms of particular preachers, and in providing congregations with something like a complete and well-balanced nourishment of the Word. One might perhaps suggest that there could conceivably be some disadvantage in too much system: for congregations are disposed to be bored by courses of sermons in which the developments are planned and advertised beforehand. There might consequently be something to be said for the Creation and the Fall coming in almost by accident on the much-abused Septuagesima and Sexagesima, as they do in England. Moreover it seems from this scheme that, with slight and occasional variations, the same lessons will be repeated on corresponding Sundays every year—which we have found in England since 1922 can quickly lead to exhaustion of the preacher's repertory. Also it must be observed that this is almost exclusively a Sunday lectionary: it might well be supplemented by a weekday course which, after the fashion of the early Reformers, worked through the Bible in strict sequence.

Dr McArthur has written a valuable book, and is to be congratulated on the responsive congregations which have made possible the work of which this is a record. One would be glad of a precise explanation of the expression (several times repeated) 'tension of co-existence': wherein lies the tension? Also one would remark that 'surely' (page 85) and similar words are question-begging terms, and ought not to be used to foreclose an argument: for, in the case in point, there is quite conceivably a very close connexion between the first Advent and the second, which the traditional lessons may serve to enforce.

E. Evans

Six Makers of English Religion. By Gordon Rupp. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

This is the sort of book which can be well written only by a man who has the vision and the balanced judgment of a competent historian and an able theologian. Professor Gordon Rupp, now teaching in the University of Manchester, has already shown in his studies in Luther how securely he combines these two qualifications. There is a wealth of good material brought together in 124 pages, and the style is vigorous and crisp. The six lectures were prepared for non-theological students at Westfield College in the University of London, but there are few even of the best trained in theology who would not owe a great deal to them.

The period covered is from 1500 to 1700, and the six very prominent, but very different, men whose life and writing are incisively studied are William Tyndale and the English Bible, Thomas Cranmer and the Book of Common Prayer, John Foxe and the *Book of Martyrs*, John Milton and *Paradise Lost*, John Bunyan and *The Pilgrim's Progress*, and Isaac Watts and his Hymns. Professor Rupp argues that the true Protestant tradition of these two centuries can best be traced in these conspicuous and abiding documents, three of which belong to the Established Church and three to Nonconformity, although they have all served for the enlightenment and enrichment of both traditions, as they have influenced millions of readers.

Some people might cavil with the title, and so the author makes it clear in the preface that by 'English religion' he means in the first place the English Protestant tradition'. He does not intend to be narrow or sectarian or merely polemical; but he is emphatic, and rightly so, that there is no need to apologise for the Reformation, as 'a disastrous interruption, or even a perversion, of Christian continuity'. He hopes that these studies may be 'an antidote to some forms of ecumenical romanticism'. He asserts that we have to beware of modern historians who underestimate the creative, religious ferment in the English Reformation.

The vast importance of Tyndale's translation for all future translations is stressed, with 90% of his words used in the Authorised Version of the New Testament. The course is fascinatingly traced by which Cranmer moves from being 'a remote and ineffectual don' to become leader and martyr. Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* is no longer alive, as it used to be, though Wesley regarded it as the first of all Christian classics. Milton, 'uncompromising and vociferous Protestant', remains the great exponent of Puritan humanism, before it became a lost cause. Bunyan illustrates other aspects of Puritanism; though he wrote in all sixty-two books, only two really count,

and in these he is the greatest Christian writer since Dante. Amid the many achievements of Isaac Watts as preacher and writer, it is most interestingly claimed that 'his great achievement, his "Divine Songs for Children" make him the all-time children's best seller before the advent of Miss Enid Blyton'. A skilful summary of all six and of their period occupies the last page.

GEORGE S. GUNN

La morale chrétienne d'après les écrits johanniques. By OLIVIER PRUNET. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1957. 800 fr.

THE Johannine ethic, says the author in his preface, has received relatively little attention. The explanation he finds in the fact that while in the Synoptics and in Paul it is possible to draw clear lines of demarcation between the theological and the ethical sections, in the Johannine writings this is not the case. Here theology and ethics are closely interwoven, in direct and constant connexion, so that a study of the ethic involves also a consideration of the basic elements of the doctrine of salvation. The reader who turns to this book in search of convenient summaries of the Johannine teaching upon particular moral problems will be disappointed, because that is not the author's approach—nor is it that of John. On the other hand, he who is content to follow the author's guidance will profit greatly, for he will be led beyond these particular problems to the fundamental basis of any ethic that is truly Christian. It may be felt at times that the theology is unduly predominant, but the book as a whole is a profound and penetrating study which does full justice to the depth of Johannine thought.

The study is based in the main upon the Gospel and the Epistles, in particular the First Epistle. The Apocalypse is left out of the reckoning, although 'it belongs, even if remotely, to the family of the Johannine writings'. Modern literature is cited sparingly, although the documentation is adequate; the footnotes consist mainly of biblical references. Readers on this side of the Channel will, however, be surprised to discover that neither Robert Law nor B. F. Westcott appears in the bibliography.

The first chapter is devoted to a discussion of the key words in the Johannine ethical vocabulary, the second to Johannine theology. The transition to the more strictly ethical part of the book is formed by a section on the ethical aspect of the doctrine of the Spirit. The third chapter, on 'the world above and the world below', begins with a study of the significance of the word *cosmos* and then proceeds to a discussion of the Johannine dualism (carefully distinguished from the Hellenistic) and the Johannine determinism. Towards the end of this chapter there is an excellent statement of the issues in-

volved for Christianity in its conflict with the Gnostic heresy. 'A defective Christology threatens the whole of the Church's body of doctrine. But Christianity is not only doctrine; it is life, or, if you will, the doctrine embraces not only the object of faith but also the rule of life. A deviation in this first domain entails a deviation on the ethical plane.' The Docetic Christology and the breach in the fellowship go together, and John meets both by the same recall to the fundamental truths of the Gospel.

The fourth and longest chapter is concerned with the ethic of the new man, and deals with the significance of the new birth and its implications for the Christian life. A useful discussion of 'the Christian and Sin' examines the two conflicting verses 1 John 1.8 and 3.6, while other sections deal with the alleged Johannine exclusivism and with morals and eschatology. On the latter subject, Prunet rejects Bultmann's view that the traces of futuristic eschatology in John are due to secondary redaction, and affirms that both 'realised' and future eschatology must be fully recognised in Johannine thought. On the former, he notes a difference between the Johannine conception of *agape* and that prevalent in the rest of the New Testament which has led some scholars to speak of Johannine exclusivism. This view is rejected by Bultmann, Dodd and Hoskyns, but Prunet is not entirely satisfied and seeks a more adequate answer.

An excursus of some six pages in smaller print deals with the Dead Sea Scrolls, and a second (at first sight surprisingly) with the *Imitatio Christi*. The first is based on somewhat meagre materials, and does not take account of the studies by Braun and Albright on the subject, but within its limits is a sober and judicious survey of the chief points of similarity. The second is more relevant than might seem, and suggests a line of study which might well be carried further. The whole is rounded off by a brief summary of the conclusions reached.

A number of misprints have been noted, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* for example appearing regularly with an acute accent instead of an apostrophe. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' title seems to have been taken as a name (his initials are given as S.E.), and the name Macgregor appears to have caused some perplexity. C. F. Howard should be W. F.

R. McL. Wilson

The Geography of the Bible. By Denis Baly. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

The author tells us that there is twenty years' work behind this book, and that fifteen of them have been spent in Palestine, and the quality of the work is evident from first to last. As a source-book for background material in the study of the Scriptures it is excellent

and deserves an unqualified commendation. Moreover, it is a beautifully produced book, at a reasonable price, and the double-column style of printing enhances its attractiveness. There are ninety-seven photographs, many of them by the author, and forty-seven maps and diagrams. The ten closely-printed pages of bibliography should satisfy the most voracious. It is possible that a more expert reviewer will find in such a book certain small inaccuracies, though they have not leapt to my eye; and it is almost certain that the professional geographer or even archaeologist may disagree with this or that conclusion. But the book is largely factual, and often casts much light on a familiar story or scene or phrase in the Old Testament.

Mr Baly, a highly trained man in his field both by study and by travel, begins with an inevitable reference to Sir George Adam Smith's *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* as 'a classic study.' Although published over sixty years ago, it is by no means superseded—but it is difficult to obtain. The same is true even of the much more recent French study by Père F. M. Abel.

In nine chapters, the more general aspects of the subject are dealt with—geology, climate, rainfall, food, vegetation, animal life and so on. This is followed by eleven chapters which describe the geography of the different regions—'Lo, I have set the land before you' —starting with the coastal plains from Asher to Esdraelon and Jezreel, through the hill country of Judah and Samaria to Tower and Upper Galilee, then on to the Rift Valley from Galilee to the Dead Sea, and finally to Trans-Jordan and out to the deserts beyond.

The teacher of the Bible in Church and School will find in this book a sure guide. It is not the province of a book on geography to deal with archaeology, except in an incidental way. The careful student and teacher might well desire to supplement Mr Baly's book by such a magnificent book as Professor G. Ernest Wright's *Biblical Archaeology* (alas, it costs four guineas!), or Dr Werner Keller's very good, if not in detail so accurate, book, *The Bible as History*, or by some of the recently-published small studies of Professor Parrot. So far as the exact, intellectual equipment is concerned, the student of these books would be well equipped for the teaching task—provided that he also had the essential qualifications of a sincere approach to the faith and truth which came to the world from 'the Land and the Book'.

It is not to be expected that Mr Baly should say much about that in a book on geography, but he says enough to let us see what his attitude is. Right at the start he gives the reasons for the claim that the country of the Bible is the real centre of the world. In the preface, he rebuts the charge of a friend that there is too much

theology in his book, and that geographers do not want theology in a geography book, by wisely observing that the presupposition of the Bible is the existence of a god of a certain character. His true point of view also shines through the closing words of the book—'It is indeed a good land, but men have not used it well. In this alone may we rejoice, that here God made Himself known to His people, and here in the fulness of time, our Lord Jesus Christ came to dwell among men.'

GEORGE S. GUNN

The Outlines of Christian Doctrine, Vols. I and II. By A. MARCUS WARD. Rs. 3.12 each.

The Parables of Jesus. By WILFRED SCOPES. Rs. 2.4.

How Shall I Study the Psalms? By A. P. CARLETON. Rs. 2.10.

The Christian Literature Society, Madras.

IT was a necessary and notable enterprise that was embarked upon three years ago, when the scheme for 'The Christian Students Library' was launched. The need for the production of a series of reliable books on theology and biblical exposition to meet the requirements of ministers and students in India had long been felt; and it was fortunate that Dr Marcus Ward of the United Theological College at Bangalore undertook a leading part in the planning of the whole series, for he had already rendered great service to biblical and theological study in India. Preachers in the older as well as in the younger Churches will be immensely benefited by the use of the volumes which have now been published.

Here are four of them. Without exception they are full of material, and it is obvious that much industry has gone into their preparation. There is nothing scamped, shallow or merely rudimentary here. The two volumes on doctrine cover all the great doctrines of the Christian religion. The general introduction and the detailed exposition in the books on the Parables and the Psalms are of a high order. At a very modest cost, the series will supply trustworthy guidance for many a day to come. It is to be hoped that they will find their way into the bookshop and manses of this country too. To put them in the hand of lay missionaries and preachers would enrich their equipment. The Church everywhere should feel encouraged that an urgent need has been so accurately measured and steps taken to meet it so promptly and adequately.

GEORGE S. GUNN

What Christ and The Church Mean to Me. Edited by D. P. THOMSON. Church of Scotland Offices. 1s.

THIS readable and lively symposium is made up of short statements from twenty-one men and women, ranging in age from twenty to

sixty, and covering a wide variety of occupations. It is good that those who normally occupy the pews should become vocal in this way, and it is a gain that the opportunity of getting into print is more easily available than it used to be. This very representative company speak not from the fringe of Christian experience but from its centre. Many will feel that there is much that is ordinary and a little conventional in the thought of these testimonies and their expression, with very few flashes. But that is no criticism; for there is much insight here into the life of the common people, and the value of the booklet lies less in what is said as in the fact that it is being said at all, and by so many different types of people. They have travelled by various roads—puzzlement, disillusionment, sorrow, temptation, ill-health, ostracism—but they have all made a discovery of Christ, and they are all agreed on the necessity for worship and witness, because their own experiences have made the life of the Church necessary and real to them. May their tribe increase! It is a sound little book to put into the hands of young people, especially those who may be sharing in the 'Tell Scotland' campaign.

GEORGE S. GUNN

Liturgies of the Primatial Sees. By ARCHDALE A. KING. Pp. 656. 70s. net. *Liturgy of the Roman Church.* By the same. Pp. 476. 42s. net. Longmans Green and Co., London, 1957.

THE earlier volume in this series, *Liturgies of the Religious Orders* (reviewed in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 9, p. 324f), has now been followed by the present two volumes, so that the series is now complete apart from a newly promised final volume on 'Liturgies of the Past'. We said that the succeeding volumes would be eagerly awaited, and they certainly come up to all expectations. We have here the same excellence of illustration—there are fifty illustrations in the first and twenty-four in the second volume—the same cleanness in typography and neatness of format. But above all there is a similar mass of detail, the same breadth of learning, and yet all presented so clearly that the reader must feel the fascination of the whole subject.

The volume on the Liturgies of the Primatial Sees is concerned with the Rites of Lyons, Braga, Milan and Toledo, the last two widely known respectively as the Ambrosian and the Mozarabic Liturgy. The arrangement is similar to that of the volume on the Rites of the Orders. There is a history of each rite and of the See, followed by notes on the furniture and ornaments of the church, the ornaments of the ministers, liturgical colours and books, the chant, the use of the Christian Year, with full descriptions of the actual rite in its various forms. These descriptions are accompanied

by generous quotations from the texts of the liturgies. In the case of each rite there is a bibliography, as well as a general bibliography for the whole volume, and special points are discussed in appendices, e.g., Proper Prefaces, Blessings, Concelebration, etc., and there is a brief but illuminating note on the Gallican liturgies.

The volume on the Roman Liturgy must, on account of its subject, have a slightly different arrangement. The first part is an historical summary, brief but adequate in view of the purpose of the work, dealing with the formation, enrichment, decline and reform of the Liturgy. The second part is entitled 'Roman Liturgy', and this covers many special subjects by way of introduction—names, languages, churches and altars, ornaments of churches and of ministers, books, rubrics, ceremonial, the question of reservation and the use of incense. The third part is a rationale of the Mass, in which each item is described and discussed with very full references to sources and other literature, and with historical and explanatory material. This has often been done before, but we have here an exceptionally clear account with the merit of being quite up-to-date. The appendices, ten in number, include discussions on such subjects as the recent simplification of the Rubrics, the Restored Order of Holy Week and the Solemn Easter Vigil, Roman Stations, Rome and Liturgical Unity, and Byzantine Influence on the Roman Rite. These are all of the greatest interest and importance, and it is fortunate that it was possible to include explanations of some recent papal decrees affecting the services of the Church.

Here as in other volumes there is a very full bibliography, but it is a pity that in these bibliographies with only one exception, the books and periodical or encyclopaedia articles are arranged alphabetically by titles, which makes reference to authors a little difficult. It must be added that each volume has a very detailed and useful index, while the notes throughout will prove of the greatest value to the student. The reader who possesses or has access to the whole set of volumes on the Western Church, as well as the two volumes on the Rites of the Eastern Church, will find them to be fascinating in their interest, encyclopaedic in their content, and scrupulous in scholarship, suitable for straightforward reading but also most valuable as permanent works of reference. JOHN A. LAMB

Public Worship. By J. A. JUNGMANN, S.J., translated by CLIFFORD HOWELL, S.J. Challoner Publications, London, 1957. Pp. 250. 21s.

THIS small manual is intended as a text-book for seminaries and as giving a proper view of the Liturgy to priests, teachers and educated

laity in general. There is no doubt that this intention will be fulfilled, and it may be added that it will act for any reader as an excellent introduction to the study of the subject. Jungmann's name is a guarantee of authenticity, of clear presentation of facts and of balance of view, with notice taken of the most recent ideas. The subjects covered include 'Basic Concepts' (corporateness, objectivity and so on), a brief history of the development, the making of liturgical laws, structural elements of the liturgy (lections, psalmody, hymns, prayer, posture), the House of God and its furnishings, the Sacramental rites, the Divine Office, and the Christian Year. Each section is of interest and value in its own way, but special attention might be drawn to the chapter on structural elements, and to that on the Church Calendar which gives an excellent, clear and informative outline of the subject. There is a good index at the end of the book.

There is no bibliography, but references are given in the footnotes to a number of other works, all foreign and mostly German, except for the English translation of the author's *Missarum Sollemnia* and two short English Breviaries. One feels that the translator might usefully have added a number of books suitable for the English reader's further study. The format and typography are good, though there are a number of printer's errors. None of them is very serious, but on pp. 9 and 21 Hippolytus is spelt 'Hyppolytus', though correct elsewhere. The book can be strongly recommended as an introduction to the study of the Liturgy, whether for Catholic or for Protestant, while the more advanced reader will enjoy perusing it and will find in it fresh ideas to interest him and old ideas made new.

JOHN A. LAMB

Principles of Christian Worship. By RAYMOND ABBA. Oxford University Press, 1957. Pp. 196. 10s. 6d. net.

THE present-day tendency to deal with questions of public worship not merely from the practical but also from the biblical and theological point of view, is a welcome one. Books on this subject no longer speak only of how to do this or that, but also of the basic reasons for the recommended action. This is as it should be. Because, for one thing, worship can never satisfy the demands of the human spirit or truly glorify God without such sanctions, and for another, this is the only way by which worshippers of different denominations can grow in understanding and sympathy with one another.

This new book on the basic principles of worship claims that the approach to the whole problem is both theological and historical,

and it may be regarded as a most useful introduction to the study of worship. Students in seminaries and colleges will find it to be of great assistance both in theoretical and practical work, as those who heard the original course of lectures in St. Andrew's College in the University of Sydney must have done. There are six chapters —on the Basic Principles (revelation and response, worship in Spirit, worship as corporate, worship and witness), on Origins and Development, a brief historical survey, on the Ministry of the Word, Public Prayer, Church Praise, and the Sacraments. It is obvious that none of these subjects can be anything like fully discussed in so short a treatise as this, but what is here is well done and should lead the student on to more advanced works to which he is frequently referred. A short bibliography indicates the lines along which further reading should go, and there is a useful index.

Altogether this is a work which can be recommended, not only indeed to the beginner, for ministers who have long been conducting services of worship can learn a great deal from it. The production of the book is good, though there are a number of printer's errors, none of them, fortunately, serious. JOHN A. LAMB

The Music of Christian Hymnody. By ERIK ROUTLEY. Independent Press Ltd., London, 1957. Pp. 308. 30s.

WHEN Dr Routley writes on hymnody, as he has done more than once, he presents his readers with readable, fresh, interesting material, marked by sound judgment and wise advice. In the present volume hymns and music come together with very happy results, supplying the reader with a book for which there is abundant room and which will be most valuable for every minister and organist, and indeed for all who are interested in the praise of the Church. The sub-title reads—'A Study of the Development of the Hymn Tune since the Reformation, with special reference to English Protestantism.' It is built on an historical plan, beginning with the Lutheran Chorale and carrying us through the various types of psalm tune to the music of the present day. Chapters of special interest are on Victorian composers, Public School Hymnody, a brief review of the Hymnody of the Roman Catholic Church, and particularly perhaps, the development since the musical re-awakening around 1890. The most recent hymn-books discussed are *Hymns Ancient and Modern (Revised)*, 1950, and the *B.B.C. Hymnbook* of 1950. No doubt many will regret that *Congregational Praise* could not be included.

For such a survey ready access to the tunes is essential, and therefore the book includes musical examples to the number of 208,

and where reference is required to tunes not among the examples, the reader is given the number in *The English Hymnal.* The general index includes the names of tunes referred to in the text, and also of hymn-books and of composers, and the fact that the names of tunes are included is of very great value.

The whole work is very well planned and the plan is excellently carried out. While it is very readable, it will also be used as a valuable reference work on hymn tunes old and new. It is likely that some readers will not agree with all the judgments passed on tunes, but in most cases good technical reasons are given for the judgment, and these certainly help the reader to a more knowledgeable attitude to the music of our hymnaries. It is to be hoped that this book will be very widely read and studied by all who are interested in the improvement of public worship.

There are a number of printer's errors, and it is a pity that the *Revised Church Hymnary* is sometimes given the wrong date, and that it is not always clearly distinguished from the *Church Hymnary* of 1898, as on p. 141. But these are small points, and we must add one real regret, that it proved impossible to publish the whole of Dr Routley's thesis instead of, as here, only about two thirds of it.

JOHN A. LAMB